

Vol. 11
No. 46.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—No. XVI.

SEPTEMBER, 1831.

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE	ART.	PAGE
I. OLD ENGLISH PROSE WRITERS The Library of the Old English Prose Writers. Vol. I. Contain- ing The Holy and Profane States, by THOMAS FULLER; with some Account of the Author and his Writings.	1	V. EDUCATION FOR THE MINIS- TRY	84
II. OPINIONS OF ORIGEN	22	An Address delivered before the Society for Promoting Theologi- cal Education, June 5, 1831. By JOHN G. PALFREY, Professor of Biblical Literature in Harvard University.	
ORIGENIS Opera Omnia, quæ Græcè vel Latine tantum extant, et ejus Nomine circumferuntur. Operâ et studio Caroli Delarue.		VI. NOYES'S TRANSLATION OF THE PSALMS	99
III. DR. WORCESTER ON THE EVILS OF CONTENTION	60	A New Translation of the Book of Psalms, with an Introduction. By GEORGE R. NOYES.	
Causes and Evils of Contentions, unveiled in Letters to Christians. By NOAH WORCESTER.		VII. STEPHEN ON SLAVERY	109
IV. SOCIAL LIFE	70	The Slavery of the British West India Colonies delineated, as it exists both in Law and Practice, and compared with the Slavery of other Countries, Ancient and Modern. By JAMES STEPHEN, Esq. Vol. II. Being a Delinea- tion of the State in point of Prac- tice.	
A Comparative View of the So- cial Life of England and France, from the Restoration of Charles the Second to the French Revolu- tion. By the Editor of Madame du Deffand's Letters.			

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY GRAY AND BOWEN.

LONDON:

ROWLAND HUNTER, AND O. RICH, RED LION SQUARE.

1831.

NOTICE.

The Christian Examiner is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers, of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May.

All communications may be directed 'To the Editors of the Christian Examiner, care of Gray & Bowen.'

GRAY & BOWEN,

NO. 141 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON,

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED

A NEW TRANSLATION of the **BOOK OF PSALMS**, with an Introduction. By **GEORGE R. NOYES**, Author of a "Translation of the Book of Job."

"We cordially welcome this book of Psalms in its new and inviting form. The religious public are already indebted to Mr. Noyes's labors for the 'Translation of Job.' Those of our readers, and we hope they are not few, who are familiar with that work, will already have anticipated benefit and gratification from this." — *Christian Register*.

ON THE FORMATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. Addressed to those who are seeking to lead a Religious Life. By **HENRY WARE, Jr.**, Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care in Harvard University. Second Edition.

"This is, in no sense, a polemical work; it enters into no discussion of doctrinal points, but assuming that those for whom it is intended are disciples of Christ by profession, and strive to be so in practice, it sets forth, in a series of well arranged and well connected arguments, the motives for, and the means of, religious improvement. No one reading these chapters in the spirit and purpose in which they seem to be written, can fail, we should think, to be edified by their earnest and eloquent admonitions and suggestions." — *New York American*.

"This is a very good practical book. It comes to the point at once. There is nothing metaphysical or unintelligible about it. It is common sense, and strong sense, throughout." — *Cincinnati American*.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS, on the Plan proposed by **LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.**

"This publication, the Editor of which is understood to be the Rev. J. G. PALFREY, supplies a want which has been felt by many. It will aid ministers in their expository lectures, be serviceable in Sunday Schools, and afford facilities of scriptural instruction in private families." — *Christian Register*.

"Whatever may be thought of some of the principles of Carpenter's plan, the Editor of this work has rendered a valuable service to the public, by carrying out these principles in the arrangement of the Gospel narratives, and furnishing us with a Harmony decidedly preferable, we think, to any other, in a much more convenient form, and combining all the advantages which arise from an orderly distribution of events and a juxtaposition of parallel passages." "It is no inconsiderable recommendation of this publication, that it is strictly what it purports to be, 'A Harmony of the Gospels.'" — *Christian Examiner*.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Nº. XLVI.

NEW SERIES — Nº. XVI.

SEPTEMBER, 1831.

ART. I. — *The Library of the Old English Prose Writers.*
Vol. I. Containing *The Holy and Profane States*, by
THOMAS FULLER; with some Account of the Author
and his Writings. 16mo. Cambridge. Hilliard & Brown.
1831.

IT has been the fate of old books, like most other old things, to be the subjects of unreasonable extremes of opinion. The judgments passed on times long since gone by appear, for the most part, to have leaned strongly either to indiscriminate and weak admiration, or to flippant contempt without examination. On the one hand, antiquity has been exalted at the expense of truth and justice. Many will allow nothing to be good, unless it be old; no modes of thinking to be sound, but such as have the sanction of more than one century at least; and no virtues to be of very high desert, but those which have been practised by the men of other days. Even truth, it has been thought, is to be decided by the authority of dates; and those, who cannot plead for their opinions the defence of times grown grey with age, have been told that their cause is not worthy to be heard. On the other hand, partly from disgust at these absurdities, partly from habits of hasty and superficial thinking, some have resorted to the opposite extreme. Considering antiquity as synonymous with error and weakness, they are disposed utterly to disparage the characters and the doings of the fathers. They look back upon their records

as the memorials of a generation, which we have left far behind in the career of excellence. Something like the condescension of pity is mingled with every view of their moral and intellectual qualities; their faults are exaggerated, or placed in strong lights; their virtues are depreciated, or overlooked; their views on all great subjects are described in the mass as encumbered with the narrowness and imperfection of their age; and their customs are mentioned only to excite the smile of self-complacent superiority, as if all that differs from present habits must of course be irrational or ludicrous. Thus, by ever running wide of the mark of impartiality, we neutralize or render useless whatever degree of justness our opinions may chance to possess.

To find a similar want of fairness and sobriety in estimating the literature of different periods, we need not take up the comparison between the times of classic antiquity and the present day. It may be seen in the treatment, which the productions of the fathers of English literature have received at the hands of their successors. If their station be computed according to the large scale of the world's ages, they are moderns. But they are in some sense ancients to us; for so rapidly do the generations of men pass away, and with them their tastes and forms of mental developement, that even two or three hundred years constitute what may be called antiquity, and give us occasion to speak of modes of writing and of thought extremely diverse from our own. That excessive admiration of the old writers, as such, which is sometimes carried to a degree of superstition scarcely inferior to the respect paid by the pagans to their deified heroes, is almost wholly confined to England. The black-letter mania is a passion, which, in its highest and most amusing forms at least, may be said to be quite unknown in this country. Even if we had the means of stimulating and gratifying it, — as we have not, — yet such are the character and circumstances of our community, that it would be long before such men as Ritson, Sir Egerton Brydges, and Dibdin would be produced among us, — long before we should have that class of fantastic devotees to time-hallowed paper and print, who will talk with all the fondness of true lovers of 'the good old books descended to us, whose backs and sides our careful grandsires buffed, and bossed, and boarded against the teeth of time, or more devouring ignorance, and whose leaves they guarded with brass,

may silver clasps, against the assaults of worm and weather.* The bibliomaniac is a character, for whom our young and bustling nation scarcely affords a place; and the shafts of satire, which have so often been aimed at his pursuits in the mother country, would here be wasted on the empty air. The joy of possessing the only known copy of a volume, in pursuit of which the anxious diligence of all other antiquarians has been at fault, and which would lose its value if its fellow could be found, is a pleasure we have not learned to taste or reverence. Engrossed, as we are, in the topics of the day or the year, and devoted to the useful and the practical, we read with a smile of contempt, or with a look of wonder, the accounts of book sales in the English metropolis, at which noblemen and scholars, in the eager competition of the auction-room, add guineas to guineas and pounds to pounds for some antique poem of a few leaves, or some thin duodecimo *extremely rare*, as the catalogues say; nor is it for us to understand the heartach of unsuccessful rivals, when the fall of the fate-deciding hammer shuts out hope, and appropriates irrecoverably the coveted treasure.

With trifling such as this we may well be content to dispense; though it would not be difficult to show, that this literary extravagance, like some other forms of extravagance, has its uses, and that while the waste labors of such enthusiasm are harmless, and soon forgotten, there may be circumstances under which its services are not unimportant to the interests of letters. But we would protest against the follies of the literary antiquarian being permitted to bring discredit on a good cause. There is a manly, healthful, and invigorating taste for the old masters of English literature and theology, which we deem valuable as a source of mental discipline and power, and which we think has not been sufficiently cultivated among us. They should be loved and studied, not merely because they belong to past generations, but on account of real excellencies,—not because time has cast a reverend appearance over their large volumes, but because these volumes contain a great deal to enrich, strengthen, and kindle the mind. In England this venerable class of writers seem to have grown into much favor within a few years, if we may judge from the new editions of their works, or the reprints of

* Nichols's Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. iv. p. 108.

separate portions of them, which have frequently appeared, and from the comments, illustrations, and critical notices, to which they have given occasion. This, we are aware, is no unerring index of the public taste; for it doubtless happens to these authors, as it has to many others, to be more praised than read. The commendation bestowed on the illustrious dead is not always a proof, that their spirit has been sought or imbibed. Probably the cases are not few in literature like that of Reynolds in his art, who, we are told, exhorted his pupils with unceasing earnestness, as his first and last charge to them, to study and imitate the works of the old masters of painting continually, while he himself devoted his great powers to a more gainful and an easier department of the art, in which, it is thought, few traces are to be found of any important influence derived from his admiration of the antique school. But whether the love of ancient English literature has become, or will become, a popular taste or not, it is nevertheless true, that some of the best British writers of modern times have drunk deeply from these fountains. It has been common to ascribe some of the vices of Johnson's style to his partiality for the works of Sir Thomas Browne; but, if the charge be not without foundation, may we not also trace to the same source some of the better qualities in his manner of writing, his energy and completeness of expression, his forceful words, and strong though stately sentences? Malone affirms that the works of Burke bear testimony to the good influence derived from the very high admiration, which he always avowed for the prose writings of Dryden, who, though he does not, strictly speaking, belong to the class of old English authors, may be regarded as nearly the last, who caught their spirit and power, before the altered tone which literature received from the wits of Anne's reign.

If it were only for the assistance rendered by the old writers in enabling us to fill up the outline of the picture of their times, we should regard them as amply worthy of a familiar acquaintance on the part of the curious inquirer. It is surely no small help to the diligent observer of man, to have the features of any period preserved, not in set descriptions, — for these may be liable to suspicion, — but in the undesigned developements, which occur in the lines traced by the busy and strong minds of the time. The narrative of the historian, even in its most interesting and faithful form, affords but

an imperfect, and comparatively faint conception of the peculiarities of an age. We are placed at a distance from the scene, and look on with somewhat of the coldness of a remote spectator. The historian seems to stand between us and what he describes, acting the part of a third person, who gives us the forms of things in the shape and color they have taken in passing through his own mind, perhaps in obedience to some favorite theory. It is better than a gratification of curiosity, — it is one of the best aids to the philosophical study of man, — to be able by any means to transplant ourselves into the midst of a past age, so as to have a fresh and distinct apprehension of the interests and characters belonging to it, a feeling of reality and acquaintance with regard to its pursuits and predominant traits. This desirable sort of knowledge is to be acquired mainly by the study of those authors who wrote, as it were, on the spot, and in the quaint but interesting style of familiarity with the events and the men of their day. They give us the fashions of thought and the forms of speculation, the prejudices and improvements, the weaknesses and the strong points, the intellectual, moral, and religious advancement or backsliding of their period, in short, 'the form and pressure' of the times; and we thence learn more satisfactorily, than from any other source, the place and value which are to be assigned to their century in a philosophical survey of man's progress. The volumes of ancient date help us to recover and to keep bright those impressions, which in the course of time were fading away in the indistinctness of general views. By means of them we preserve the animating touches of reality, which imagination tells us we should find, if we could summon the men of those days from the slumber of the tomb, and by personal acquaintance gather their opinions and treasure up the information they would have to bestow. History dwells so much, sometimes so exclusively, on the outward and showy doings of a community; it describes a battle so much more frequently and better, than an intellectual movement, that we feel the want of some insight deeper and more true to reality, than it commonly undertakes to afford; and this want will doubtless be best supplied from the sources we have indicated.

But a large proportion of these writers have a strong claim upon our attention for other reasons. We think that in their volumes are to be found some of the richest treasures of

thought and wisdom, some of the most beautiful and splendid imagery, some of the happiest illustrations, and some of the most acute and profound exhibitions of argumentative power, which our language affords. They wrote with a fulness of intellect, a complete mastery of their subject, not often found in modern literature. They seem to have grown up under a discipline adapted to make their minds large and robust; and they unburdened them on whatever topic with a prodigal abundance, which is frequently indeed wearisome, and sometimes runs riot in repulsive extravagance, but which is the source of a power and excellence scarcely witnessed since their day. When they address the reader, they seem to take the chair of instruction like those, who feel that they are worthy to sit there; and we are at once conscious of being in the presence of minds, that are to be treated with no common reverence. Their plentiful stores of learning were not accumulated in vain; and, if not poured forth with sufficient moderation and good judgment, were used with effect when they had a speculation to pursue, a duty to enforce, a truth to teach, or a point to illustrate. They were not, as we are apt to suppose, a tribe of heavy scholars, "dreaming away their years in the arms of studious retirement, like Endymion with the moon, as the tale of Latmus goes," but for the most part, if not personally actors in busy or agitating scenes, they stood in no idle connexion with such scenes; and amidst the trials and exigencies of their time, they held not their scholarship as lazy possessors, but as efficient workmen. We know that in stating their merits, there has been occasionally a species of heedless exaggeration. It was once said, and has been often repeated, with regard to the old writers, especially the old divines, that 'there were giants on the earth in those days,' — intellectual heroes of large forms and noble bearing, who have passed away from the world, — that such men are now no more, and that they have left their productions to be the study of a degenerate race, who must regard them as the naturalist regards the discovered remains of a class of animals now extinct. In all this there is unquestionably much extravagance, much of that silly affectation, which thinks it looks like wisdom to disparage the present or the near, and to observe no measure in extolling the past or the distant. Still we maintain, that in ranging over the literary and intellectual efforts of man, we shall not often find in the whole

compass of the survey better stores of well ripened wisdom, nor strike upon more precious veins of manly, nervous, far-reaching thought, than among the English ancients. Their labors have certainly furnished to many of a later day ample materials or helps; their gold has been beaten out into less ponderous forms; the treasure, which they cast forth, has been taken up, and moulded into diverse shapes according to the wants or the fashion of the times, or analyzed that the art of producing new treasures may be learned. Can any one read the 'Defence of Poesy,' in which imagination, fine thought, and learning are wrought into such beautiful and chivalrous forms by Sidney, 'warbler of poetic prose,' as Cowper calls him, or the 'Hydriotaphia,' the 'Religio Medici,' or the 'Christian Morals' of Sir Thomas Browne, over whose wisdom a rich and mellow coloring is spread, imparting to it an effect like that of fine old paintings; or the 'Essays' of Lord Bacon, whose marvellous genius has left the print of its mighty grasp in practical morals, as well as in the new creation of science; or the 'Areopagitica' of Milton, that noble production of a lofty and most affluent mind; can any one, we ask, read such works as these — not to mention a long list of others which might be adduced, — and then say, that there is not a spirit there, with which it is worth while to go apart and hold communion? Is there not something there, with which our minds may be nourished and built up? Is the voice, which sounds forth from these distant places of English intellect, to be unheeded, because it speaks in a tone different from any we hear among our contemporaries? Shall the forms of departed great ones be despised, because their garb is in a fashion different from our own? While we are busy with picking up such treasures, as may be had on the surface of the ground, shall we not do well to remember, that there are mines beneath, the ore of which, if it should cost us some labor, will richly repay us for our trouble? We cannot but think, that the lover of English literature and of mental greatness should regard these old masters, as the ancient Romans are said to have regarded the family images of their distinguished fathers, arranged in the order of time around the halls of their dwellings, presenting at once venerable memorials and stimulating examples.

We rate the value of these authors high on another account. They present an exhibition of one of the forms, through which

English style has passed ; and for that reason they deserve and will reward the careful attention of the student of literature. The power of our language, as an instrument for the expression of profound thought and lofty imagination, cannot be known in all its fulness without an acquaintance with the writers from the time of Elizabeth to the Restoration. We do not mean simply, that in them is to be found by far the best and most truly significant part of our vocabulary ; but that in the combination of words, and in the general structure of style, they exhibit the raciness and vigor of the language in a manner almost unknown during the period, when the French taste in various forms was infused into English literature, and when the leading tendency was to consider excellence in writing as nearly synonymous with cold correctness and feeble neatness. The authors of an earlier age were not afraid to be energetic, though at the risk of the kindred faults. They took not hold of the language, as they would of an instrument which they were too timid to wield with strength, but as one which they would have perform its office with power and effect. We are aware of the objection so often made, that their sentences are long, harsh, and obscure ; that there is in their compositions a tedious and elaborate amplitude, which makes us glad to lay down their works ; and that if we take them up again, it is from a sense of duty, perhaps, or for some special purpose, not from the expectation of pleasure. With respect to some of them there is doubtless no inconsiderable truth in this criticism, though it gives but one side of the case. The reading of not a few of their writings is a task, and a heavy task too. In their time, the faulty taste, which sprung up with the revival of letters, and accompanied its progress, had not ceased to exert a very considerable influence. We mean the taste for pedantic display, for overloading every subject with learned allusions or illustrations, as if it were impossible to crowd into their pages too much of the newly found erudition, of which they were so enamoured. Erasmus only expressed strongly a feeling, which was common among scholars, when he declared in one of his epistles, that ‘ as soon as he could get money, he would purchase first Greek authors, and secondly clothes.’ This zeal, which now, perhaps, appears simply amusing, was, however, more than pardonable ; it was honorable at a time when the beauties of the ancient world were bursting upon the eyes

of men, after the shades of night had rested over them so long, like some fine piece of sculpture, that has for ages been buried in the ruins of a convulsion of nature, and is at last restored as it came from the hands of the artist. It was to be expected, however, that such a state of things should lead, as it did, to no little extravagance, and that it would require some time to establish the proper distinction between a blind idolatry and a just admiration of the ancients. The faults, which grew out of this literary revolution, extended their infection among the English authors, at least down to the reign of Anne, and appeared in various shapes, especially in the pedantic and cumbrous manner of writing, which has been made the subject of much censure, and of some ridicule.* But with respect to a large portion of these authors, this censure has been pressed quite too far; and meanwhile, their rich significance and peculiar strength of style have been left out of the account. Notwithstanding the faults, to which we have adverted as having sprung from an ill directed partiality for ancient learning, it is still true that the Saxon part of our language was in great favor with these writers, and that for the most part their diction savours strongly of an attachment to its expressive and beautiful peculiarities. After making all the allowances, which may be claimed, we yet maintain that he, who would obtain full possession of the treasures of the English tongue, and understand all its expressiveness, must form and retain a familiar acquaintance with the authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In all of them he may find much that is uncouth and overstrained, and in some he may be offended with those conceits and false ornaments, which Shaftesbury calls 'the hobby-horse and rattle of the Muses;' but, if his reading be selected with a tolerably judicious choice, he cannot fail to imbibe a relish for that manly and hearty style, which, with all its faults, is a far bet-

* It would seem from the following amusing and caustic remarks in Wilson's 'Art of Rhetorick,' published in 1553, that pedantry in the use of language was considered then, as now, rather the fault of smattering pretenders than of true scholars; — 'The unlearned or foolish fantastical, that smells but of learning (such fellows as have seen learned men in their day) will so Latin their tongues, that the simple cannot but wonder at their talk, and think surely they speak by some revelation. I know them that think rhetorick to stand wholly on dark words; and he that can catch an inkhorn term by the tail, him they count to be a fine Englishman, and a good rhetorician.'

ter model than the insipid and well-trimmed accuracy of refinement, falsely so called.

The distinctive merits of the theological writers belonging to the period, of which we speak, have been so often and so well discussed, that they may be considered, we suppose, as pretty fairly understood. The keen and sometimes exasperating excitement in ecclesiastical affairs, which prevailed in England with little intermission during at least three successive reigns, and the times of the Commonwealth, gave a peculiar cast to the character and writings of the clergy. They were distinguished by the restless and earnest spirit, which was the natural result of the conviction, that interests of a most stirring nature were at stake. They were thrown upon a crisis of affairs, when religion and politics pressed upon them many stimulating topics of inquiry and controversy. The elements of revolution, which had been put in motion by the Reformation, were then quick and plentiful in the land; and the results, into which they would finally settle, were not as yet ascertained. It was not simply the striving of sect against sect, but a contest in which the ecclesiastical and civil interests of a kingdom were involved; and the agitation was one which affected not local parties, but a whole community. There was a time when Queen Elizabeth, by a proclamation, prohibited, or attempted to prohibit, preaching,—for the sake, as she said, of promoting peace, godliness, and charity.* At such a period, the clergy would not be likely to fall into the dulness of men well at ease. Even the prelates could not slumber in the sunshine of the church; and as for the Puritans, they counted it their lot and portion to fight what they believed to be the good fight of faith. The natural result of such a state of things may be seen in that spirit of fervor and earnestness, which breathes through the writings of most of the old divines, and extends to other topics besides those which were more immediately in controversy; for moral warmth is in its nature so expansive, that it spreads its influence in a greater or less degree over all our views and our habits of thought, and he, whose mind has been habitually accustomed to excitement in one direction, will be likely to carry with him a kindred spirit into other subjects. That the leading theologians of those days were men of great erudition,

* Strype's *Annals of the Reformation*, Vol. 1. Appendix.

will not, probably, be denied. Perhaps they had too much of it; or rather, perhaps they knew not always how to prevent it from becoming oppressive to the intellect. They would, doubtless, have thought it quite beneath the dignity of their large scholarship to be satisfied with the standard, which Bishop Atterbury established for himself, when he said, 'I sometimes know where learning is, and how to make use of it, when I want it;' but this is probably all, that many of the most efficient and successful scholars in the world have known.

There is, moreover, a much greater amount of noble views and of true liberality among the old divines, than is commonly supposed. In the works of John Hales, of Jeremy Taylor (especially 'The Liberty of Prophesying'), of Baxter, and others, we are refreshed and delighted with generous and hearty vindications of enlightened piety, religious independence, and Christian charity. No men have seen more clearly, or said more plainly, that there is nothing narrow, dark, or exclusive in the character and requisitions of the Gospel. Most of the fathers of English theology had minds full fraught on the subject of religion; and some of them sounded the depths of the human soul, with reference to this its most sacred interest, in the spirit of the true science of sanctity. They redeemed from captivity great truths, which had been long shut up under the reign of scholastic and monkish power. The philosophy of man's spiritual nature, as affected by religious culture, has seldom been better understood than by these men. They looked into the principles of that higher life in the soul, which sometimes appears only in faint struggles, and sometimes flashes forth in strong motions towards the Great Source whence it came. They knew that there is a wisdom leading to God, better than all the wisdom of the schools, and that it belongs to the life-giving efficacy of divine truth to mature this wisdom, by exalting the soul and representing it as that on which God has written his name and stamped his image. They felt and set forth the great truth, that when we regard our moral nature as we ought, we shall find there, so to speak, a Urim and Thummim, which it wears as a breast-plate, and by which we may ask counsel of God. No man of religious feeling can read some of the writings of Henry More, or the Select Discourses of John Smith, without being impressed with the conviction that he is holding intercourse with minds,

that had singularly elevated views of the spiritual relations and the spiritual bearings of man. Their sermons were, according to the fashion of the times, very long, and consequently they may be found to have dilated where compression would have been better; but many of their discourses are storehouses of lofty thoughts and admirable illustrations. 'It is my full conviction,' says Coleridge, 'that in any half dozen sermons of Dr. Donne, or Jeremy Taylor, there are more thoughts, more facts and images, more excitements to inquiry and intellectual effort, than are presented to the congregations of the present day in as many churches or meetings during twice as many months. Yet both these were the most popular preachers of their times, were heard with enthusiasm by crowded and promiscuous audiences, and the effect produced by their eloquence was held in reverential and affectionate remembrance by many attendants on their ministry, who, like the pious Isaac Walton, were not themselves men of learning or education.'

The most prevalent faults of the old English authors, considered as a class, are the faults of overdoing. The *ne quid nimis* was a precept, to which they paid but little respect. No fear of making too large demands on the patience of the reader was before their eyes. Their object too often seems to have been to say all that could be said, rather than to select what was best to be said. If a point was to be illustrated from history, or by literary authorities, they were so prodigal in the use of their resources, that the point itself was sometimes lost under the load of quotations heaped upon it. If a subject was to be analyzed, and separated into its parts, their definitions and distinctions were likely to be multiplied and refined, till they became almost evanescent, or till it required a greater effort of attention to follow the process, than to comprehend the subject proposed, or to solve the difficulty started. Argument was frequently expanded, and pushed to the utmost limits of application, till it ceased to produce the conviction, which it would, had it been used with cautious precision, or with more concentrated strength. And wit was pursued with so much perverse ingenuity, and through such artificial connexions of thought, that the flavor of the Attic salt, which might at first have belonged to it, often evaporated during the operation. Some of the prose writers of old must certainly be included in the censure so commonly passed on what

Johnson, rather inaptly, calls the metaphysical school of poetry, who toiled for conceits, and deemed themselves successful only when they had put forth each thought or fancy in some startling or grotesque form, and who cared little how whimsical or extravagant were the combinations of ideas and of language they produced, so they were but ingenious and strange. Good taste, at least in the sense commonly assigned to that expression, was certainly not the characteristic of the period as a whole, in any department of writing. That vicious manner, which is the obvious result of an indiscriminate application of erudition, and of excessive amplification in the management of a subject, was so much in accordance with the taste of the age, that it seems to have been deemed an excellence, of which an author did well to be ambitious. Hence that strange union of gross faults and inimitable beauties, which may so frequently be observed in the same writer. Hence the combination, side by side, of coarse and offensive illustrations with the loftiest conceptions and the finest out-breaks of imagination.

It is for reasons like these, we suppose, that the productions of the fathers of English literature and theology, venerable and admirable as they are on the whole, have gained in modern times so little comparatively of the attention, which they well deserve, and that the complaint has been so often repeated of the wearisome and uninviting labor of searching into their treasures. A great majority of intelligent and well educated readers are probably willing to consign these volumes to the curious antiquary, who has sufficient zeal to endure the task of studying them, while they are content to draw their mental resources from the neater and more compact volumes of recent times. The books of these instructors of past centuries are thought by many to be as ill adapted to the taste and wants of the present day, as the armour and trappings worn by the ancient knights, the lance, the shield, and the coat of mail, would be to the improved warfare of modern times. They would as soon think, perhaps, of introducing into their apartments the bulky and ponderous chairs, the heavy oaken tables, and in general the cumbrous furniture of their fathers, as of placing on their book shelves the large, dark, and formidable volumes, in which are deposited the learning, the wit, or the reasoning, that seems to them to have had its day, and to have passed into oblivion.

We know not how the injustice thus done to these writers, arising partly from an impatience of their somewhat obtrusive and vexatious faults, can be better remedied, than by well chosen selections from their works, accompanied with interesting sketches of their lives and times. For this reason, as well as on other accounts, we welcome with much satisfaction the volume which has given occasion to our remarks. It is the first in a series intended to constitute a Library of the old English prose writers, set forth in the convenient and attractive form required by the taste of the times. Should the work be encouraged, as it ought to be, and as we trust it will be, the editor intends to proceed with the publication of extracts and selections, embracing the most interesting portions and exhibiting some of the finest specimens of 'the patriarchs of our early literature,' with occasional explanatory notes, and with such accounts of these worthies and their writings, as can be given in a compendious form. We think that the editor, the Rev. Mr. Young, will render a valuable and thank-worthy service to the community in fulfilling this excellent design; and we have entire confidence in the skill, judgment, and good taste, with which the work will be conducted. We hope that a series of volumes, like the neat and beautiful one now before us, will do much to bring into general favor a class of writers, who ought to be had in everlasting remembrance, but who now are in the hands of very few readers among us. We know it is sometimes said, that the rarity of a book is sufficient evidence against it; for, if it were good for anything, it would not be rare. This remark, in some of the applications of which it is susceptible, is entirely correct; but when made with reference to such authors as are embraced in the work before us, however pointed it may appear, it is altogether untrue. The list given by Mr. Young of those, from whom he purposes to make his selections, includes names that have long been venerable and dear to every one, who loves to commune with exalted and strong minds. There are some, whom we could wish to add to the list. We will mention only Ben Jonson's 'Discoveries,' and 'The Parable of the Pilgrim' by Patrick, afterwards Bishop of Ely, and well known as a commentator on the Scriptures. Of this last mentioned work there are portions, which, for their beauty and good sense, well deserve to be republished. It is, we suspect, almost wholly unknown in this country, and even in England has attracted

much less attention than might have been expected. It was published about the same time with the far-famed 'Pilgrim's Progress,' to which in the general plan and purpose it bears some resemblance. But, though greatly inferior to Bunyan's work in ingenuity and attractiveness of narrative, it is very decisively superior in compass of thought, and in the higher qualities of taste and judgment.

The first volume in the proposed work, to which we have called the attention of our readers, consists of selections from 'The Holy State' and 'The Profane State' of Fuller. This is a good beginning; for it would not be easy to find a better specimen of pleasant and acute wisdom, than is here presented. Fuller is an old and highly esteemed favorite with all, whose reading has been much among the writers of that period. He should be more generally known, and his good things should have a wider circulation; for there are many parts of his works better adapted, perhaps, than those of any other theologian of his age to take the character of popular reading. He lived in times full of perils and sharp trials, especially to the clergy; and his reputation, though not his personal welfare, passed uninjured through them all. He was never a warm partisan; but it could not be said of him, that he 'was so supple that he brake not a joint in all the alterations of the times.' During the agitating period embraced by the reign of Charles the First and the Commonwealth, Fuller adhered firmly to the royal cause; and notwithstanding his moderate and conciliatory views, he shared the obloquy and disaster, which were the natural consequence of attachment to a defeated party. At the Restoration he was in favor at court, and would have been rewarded with a bishopric, had it not been prevented by his death, which happened in August, 1661. He took no part in the heated religious disputes of his day, and appears somewhat studiously to have avoided polemical theology, thinking perhaps that, as he himself has said, it is 'ill dancing for nimble wits on the precipices of dangerous doctrines,' or that he might spend his time more profitably for himself and others, than by plunging into a contest, in which there was so much to be blamed in all parties, while truth and candor were so little regarded by any. He has certainly rendered a better service to posterity, than if he had employed his powers on the question of the divine right of bishops, or on some other points which were then absorbing topics of controversy.

Fuller was regarded as an extraordinary man by his contemporaries; and the judgment has been and will be confirmed, the more he is known. That he had his share in the literary faults of his age, is not to be disputed; and they, who will judge his writings by no standard, but such as is applied at the present day, will doubtless find much to be offended with. But it would be gross injustice to deny his claim to great and distinguishing excellence. He possessed a capacious and vigorous mind, filled even to overflowing with the knowledge to be gained both from books and men, strong in its native powers, and kept bright by habits of keen and astute observation. His astonishing power of memory was, perhaps, never surpassed by that of any individual. His learning, large and various as its stores were, appears never to have overlaid his intellect, but to have been used, if not always necessarily, yet aptly and for purposes truly connected with the matter in hand, and not in that tasteless and diffuse manner, which marked the compositions of not a few among his contemporaries. As a reasoner, in the restricted sense of the word, he was not distinguished. His excellence consisted rather in that practical and sagacious turn of mind, which arrives at valuable results without going through the process of premises and inferences, and which spreads out the fruits of its meditations in sage and amusing remarks on life and on the springs of human character and passions. We know not where we should find a richer fund of this sort of entertaining wisdom, than is to be had in many of his pages.

The quality, which is usually thought to stand out in most striking relief in Fuller's works, is his untiring humor. This was indeed the ruling passion of his soul. He could say nothing without saying it, if possible, quaintly and facetiously. It seems to have been a lesson of self-denial, which he never learned, to pass by a jocose turn of thought or expression, and leave it unused. If there were two ways of stating a sentiment or giving a description, the one literal and grave, the other witty and allusive, he was pretty sure to choose the latter. Yet in this quality Fuller, though he surpassed some others, was far from being alone. We are accustomed to consider the divines of two centuries ago as grave, dignified, and stern men, whose countenances never relaxed into a smile, and who wrote and thought, as they are imagined to have lived and walked, only in the old-fashioned clerical state-

liness. Yet the fact is, that many of them indulged in a vein of humor, and sometimes broad humor too, in their preaching and writings, which would be altogether startling to 'the men of these degenerate days.' We wonder what an audience would think now, were they to hear such gibes and jests, as were not unfrequently uttered from English pulpits in the reigns of Elizabeth, James, the first and second Charles, and even at an earlier period. Whoever has read Latimer's sermons, must remember that he relates many a mirthful anecdote in them, and sometimes with the prefatory remark, that he is about to tell 'a merry toy.' The sermons of John Hales of Eton are not wanting in strokes of facetiousness, which might be deemed free enough for the pleasantry of familiar conversation. The raillery and wit of Eachard would not fail in comparison with those of Swift; and the unsparing sarcasms, and coarse, but pungent, ridicule of South are well known to all who have looked into his strange, yet valuable, discourses, which are the productions of a strong mind given up to the impulses of feelings at least equally strong. But the facetious qualities of Fuller, abundant as they were to a fault, were always good-natured and free from asperity, the spontaneous glee of a mind that had an irresistible propensity to disport itself in this sort of pastime. It was not sharp enough to answer to his own description of the wit of Erasmus, who, he says, 'was a badger in his jeers; where he did bite, he would make his teeth meet.' Calamy in his life of Howe, having mentioned the services which Howe rendered to several of the Royalists and Episcopalians, when they were brought before the *Tryers*, appointed in Cromwell's time to test their qualifications for the exercise of the ministry, relates the following characteristical anecdote of Fuller: 'Among the rest that apply'd to him for advice upon that occasion, the celebrated Dr. Thomas Fuller, who is well known by his punning writings, was one. That gentleman, who was generally upon the merry pin, being to take his turn before these *Triers*, of whom he had a very formidable notion, thus accosted Mr. Howe, when he apply'd to him for advice: "Sir," said he, "you may observe I am a pretty corpulent man, and I am to go through a passage that is very strait; I beg you would be so kind as to give me a shove, and help me through." He freely gave him his advice, and he promis'd to follow it; and when he appear'd before them, and they propos'd to him

the usual question — whether he had ever had any experience of a work of grace upon his heart, — he gave this in for answer, that he could appeal to the Searcher of hearts that he made conscience of his very thoughts; with which answer they were satisfy'd, as indeed well they might.* One cannot but suspect that the Tryers were too glad to be well rid, at any rate, of a man like Fuller, not to grant him a dispensation on easy terms.

The various writings of Fuller possess very different degrees of interest for the modern reader. Some of them are elaborately wrought, and of formidable size; others would seem to have been thrown off without much effort, and because his pen could never bear to be idle. It may have happened in this, as in other cases, that what the author himself considered as of least price, has been found most extensively useful and acceptable. 'The Historie of the Holy Warre' is written in a manner at once vigorous and playful, abounding in shrewd and sound remarks, and exhibiting throughout no ordinary grasp of mind and reach of thought. The subject of the crusades has scarcely been treated with more ability by any subsequent author. With all its oddness and its antiquated diction, we read it with more satisfaction than we can the heavy and affected work of Mills. It contains not a few masterly descriptions of men and events, and we think the sketch of the character of Saladine scarcely falls behind the best delineations of Hume and Gibbon in spirit, discrimination, and graphical power. — In 'The Worthies of England,' Fuller has given a diffuse and rather minute account of the remarkable men and remarkable things in each of the several shires of England and Wales. He gathered the materials for this work with unwearied diligence from conversation and tradition, as well as from books. A large part of the information, which it embodies, is too local to be interesting at the present day, at least in this country, and it contains not a little of tedious trifling; but it is a valuable old volume for the great mass of curious facts, and of shrewd and amusing remarks, which it presents.* Both this work, and the

* Among the curious items in this ancient folio, in the account of Rutlandshire is the story of the dwarf, of whom Walter Scott makes so pleasant a use in 'Peveril of the Peak,' under the name of Sir Geoffrey Hudson. Fuller gives his name Jeffery, mentions the circumstance of the pie, and says he was a captain of horse in the king's army during the civil wars.

'Church History of Britain,' notwithstanding their obvious and acknowledged faults, are treated with quite too much asperity of censure by Bishop Nicolson. We have not space to speak of the 'Abel Redivivus,' the 'Good Thoughts in Bad times,' &c., and several other of his writings.

The most interesting of Fuller's works, if not the best in every respect, are 'The Holy State' and 'The Profane State.' They consist of a series of moral portraits, or descriptions of good and bad characters and qualities in the several stations and relations of life, illustrated sometimes by biographical sketches, and seasoned throughout with the peculiarities of the humorous author.* This mode of delineating characters in the abstract, or the description of persons as representing a class, was a style of writing much in vogue in the seventeenth century, and seems to have been regarded by the authors of that time as a whetstone to their epigrammatic ingenuity. The 'Characterisms of Virtues and Vices,' by Bishop Hall, is the earliest specimen of this way of writing, with which we are acquainted, in English literature. Sir Thomas Overbury's 'Characters, or Witty Descriptions,' Bishop Earle's 'Microcosmography,' and Butler's 'Characters' (in the second volume of the 'Genuine Remains,' published by Thyer), are striking productions of the same kind, especially the last mentioned, which is distinguished by all the satirical power and caustic discrimination of the author of *Hudibras*. Fuller's works, to which we have adverted as belonging to this class, are full of wisdom conceived and exhibited in his peculiar fashion. For sagacious observations on life and manners, on the curious mechanism of character and action, and for a fine flow of manly and sometimes beautiful thought, spiced sufficiently with the quaintness of a facetious spirit, we know not to what works we should turn more readily than to the *Holy* and the *Profane State*. They are the overflowing of a mind, which had been intently engaged in taking note of the moral

* A singular mistake respecting the authorship of these works is committed by Dr. Wordsworth in his 'Ecclesiastical Biography.' He ascribes them to the pen of Nicholas Ferrar, who, it seems, was in the habit of employing the women of his family in transcribing valuable publications, for the purpose of having them illuminated and bound in a choice manner. Among others thus prepared, a manuscript copy of the *Holy* and *Profane State* was found among his papers after his death; and this circumstance, it is said, led Dr. Wordsworth into his strange error.

phenomena of man. They are well adapted to perform one of the best offices, which a book can perform, — that of making the reader think; not only furnishing him with suggestions of great practical importance, but awakening and stimulating his mind to reflections of its own. For works like these, the times of peculiar agitation in which Fuller lived, and in which every form of character, whether generous and pure, or fantastic and vile, was strongly developed, may have furnished unusually ample materials and excitement.

Of the cast of thought and mode of writing in this work, the following passages on Anger, and on Self-praising, will afford fair specimens.

‘Let not thy anger be so hot, but that the most torrid zone thereof may be habitable. Fright not people from thy presence with the terror of thy intolerable impatience. Some men, like a tiled house, are long before they take fire, but once on flame there is no coming near to quench them.’ — p. 173.

‘Anger kept till the next morning, with manna, doth putrefy and corrupt; save that manna corrupted not at all, and anger most of all, kept the next sabbath. Saint Paul saith, “Let not the sun go down on your wrath;” to carry news to the antipodes in another world of thy revengeful nature. Yet let us take the Apostle’s meaning, rather than his words, with all possible speed to depose our passion, not understanding him so literally that we may take leave to be angry till sunset: then might our wrath lengthen with the days; and men in Greenland, where day lasts above a quarter of a year, have plentiful scope of revenge. And as the English (by command of William the Conqueror) always raked up their fire, and put out their candles, when the curfew-bell was rung; let us then also quench all sparks of anger, and heat of passion.’ — pp. 173, 174.

‘He whose own worth doth speak, need not speak his own worth. Such boasting sounds proceed from emptiness of desert: whereas the conquerors in the Olympian games did not put on the laurels on their own heads, but waited till some other did it. Only anchorets that want company may crown themselves with their own commendations.

‘It sheweth more wit but no less vanity to commend one’s self not in a straight line but by reflection. Some sail to the port of their own praise by a side-wind; as when they dispraise themselves, stripping themselves naked of what is their due, that the modesty of the beholders may clothe them with it again; or when they flatter another to his face, tossing the ball to him

that he may throw it back again to them; or when they commend that quality, wherein themselves excel, in another man (though absent) whom all know far their inferior in that faculty; or lastly, (to omit other ambushes men set to surprise praise) when they send the children of their own brain to be nursed by another man, and commend their own works in a third person, but if challenged by the company that they were authors of them themselves, with their tongues they faintly deny it, and with their faces strongly affirm it.' — pp. 155, 156.

In the following extract from 'The Good Sea-Captain,' there is a strain of vivid and imaginative writing, though occasionally disfigured by an uncouth expression.

'Tell me, ye naturalists, who sounded the first march and retreat to the tide, "Hither shalt thou come, and no further?" Why doth not the water recover his right over the earth, being higher in nature? Whence came the salt, and who first boiled it, which made so much brine? When the winds are not only wild in a storm, but even stark mad in a hurricane, who is it that restores them again to their wits, and brings them asleep in a calm? Who made the mighty whales, who swim in a sea of water, and have a sea of oil swimming in them? Who first taught the waters to imitate the creatures on land? so that the sea is the stable of horse-fishes, the stall of kine-fishes, the sty of hog-fishes, the kennel of dog-fishes, and in all things the sea the ape of the land. Whence grows the ambergris in the sea? which is not so hard to find where it is, as to know what it is. Was not God the first shipwright? and all vessels on the water descended from the loins (or ribs rather) of Noah's ark? Or else who durst be so bold, with a few crooked boards nailed together, a stick standing upright, and a rag tied to it, to adventure into the ocean? What loadstone first touched the loadstone? or how first fell it in love with the north, rather affecting that cold climate than the pleasant east, or fruitful south or west? How comes that stone to know more than men, and find the way to the land in a mist?'* — pp. 113, 114.

* In 'Vivian Grey,' part second, there is a direct plagiarism of a portion of the above extract from Fuller. Essper George addresses the sea as follows; 'O thou indifferent ape of earth, — what art thou, O bully Ocean, but the stable of horse-fishes, the stall of cow-fishes, the sty of hog-fishes, and the kennel of dog-fishes?' — A modern novelist might probably deem himself very secure in plundering the folio of an old divine; but one would hardly have expected him to think of resorting to such a source.

We trust that a literary undertaking so judiciously and well begun, will not fail for want of the patronage of our reading community. Should it proceed, as it has commenced, a set of volumes will appear, which will surely deserve and claim a place in the libraries of all, who love the wisdom of 'olden time.' Enough, and more than enough, of our attention is called and given to the productions adapted to meet and satisfy the transient taste of the day, springing up in crowds with a rapidity that would be fearful, did they not pass away with equal rapidity, and leading us to suppose that the advice, which was long since given, is not thought to be out of season now :

' Stir, stir, for shame ; thou art a pretty scholar.
Ask how to live ? Write, write, write any thing ;
The world 's a fine believing world, — write news.'

It is necessary, doubtless, that in the literary, as well as in the natural world, an annual supply should be provided for annual consumption. But meanwhile there is danger, lest the great minds of past generations should be forgotten by us, or treated with a neglect at once ungrateful to them and injurious to ourselves. We are far enough from wishing to see the antiquarian bibliomania displace important and useful studies. But we do wish to witness the prevalence of such a sound and just taste for the strong good sense, the exciting energy, and the intellectual riches of the older authors, as shall take away all occasion for the complaint, so beautifully expressed by Mr. Young, that 'the moss has been suffered to creep over "the wells of English undefiled," and hide their clear and sparkling waters from the general view.'

ART. II. — ORIGENIS *Opera Omnia, quæ Græcè vel Latine tantum extant, et ejus Nomine circumferuntur.* Operâ et studio Caroli Delarue. Parisiis. 1733–1759. 4 vol fol.

AT the conclusion of our remarks on the life and writings of Origen, in our last Number, we intimated our purpose to treat, in a future Number, of his opinions. The greater part

of his errors and extravagances, as it will appear, were derived from the corrupt philosophy which was then prevalent in Egypt, and with which his mind had become deeply imbued in the schools of Clement and Ammonius, the latter of whom was, at that time, chief of the sect of Alexandrian Platonists, and one of its most distinguished ornaments.

Origen's views of the Deity will not long detain us. He was accused by subsequent Fathers of circumscribing the power of the Divine Being, asserting that he created only as much matter as he could dispose and adorn, and that by his omnipotence we are to understand simply a dominion over things actually existing, 'the heavens, the earth, sun, moon, and stars, and all that is in them.' We shall not pause to examine the foundation of this charge, which may be regarded as in itself frivolous, and the discussion of which would plunge us into the dark abysses of the Alexandrian philosophy.

It has been made a question, whether he regarded the Deity as corporeal, or incorporeal. On this, as on several other points, his opinions, or at least his language fluctuates, and he appears not always consistent with himself. In the present instance, however, we believe that it is not difficult to reduce his apparently conflicting expressions into harmony with each other. With the ancients generally, he believed spirit to consist of an exceedingly subtile and attenuated substance, wholly unlike the gross and palpable bodies we bear about with us, but still not destitute of materiality, and in some sort strictly corporeal.* In this sense, he seems to have supposed the Deity corporeal. True, in parts of his writings, particularly in his books 'Of Principles,' if we may trust to the version of Rufinus, he says distinctly and repeatedly that God is incorporeal. But the term is evidently to be understood as subject to the qualification just pointed out. The Deity is not corporeal in the gross sense of the term, but he is so in the more refined sense, in which all spiritual beings, according to Origen, are to be regarded as such, all, from the Deity down to the human soul, being supposed by him, as we shall hereafter show, to partake of the same essence. Tertullian expressly ascribes a body to the Deity.† But Origen has not expressed himself so grossly, though, as we have

* De Princip. Præf.

† Adv. Prax. c. 7.

seen, he supposed a very intimate union between matter and God.*

In other respects, he appears to have entertained just and elevated conceptions of the nature and attributes of the Divine Being. He ascribes to him the greatest goodness and equity, and an absolute supremacy over all other beings, including the Son. With regard to the latter, he participated in the sentiments which were common to the age, and which were originally derived, as we contend, from Platonic sources. A rapid glance at the history of these sentiments may be necessary to put our readers in complete possession of the views of Origen, and fulfil our design of tracing the rise and progress of the doctrine of the trinity.

The first century was characterized by great simplicity of doctrine. The primitive Christians, it is true, appear to have sometimes applied the title *God* to Christ, but in a sense totally different from that in which it came afterwards to be attributed to him. His miraculous birth, his Messiahship, and the state of glory to which he was advanced after a painful and ignominious death, — God having ‘raised him up,’ and ‘highly exalted him,’ making him ‘both Lord and Christ,’ for the ‘suffering of death’ crowning him with ‘glory and

* He taught, according to Jerome, (Epist. 94, al. 59, ad Avitum,) that all bodies, that is, all of the grosser sort, will be finally converted into spiritual substances, that all corporeal nature will be reduced back to the divine, which is the ‘most excellent,’ and then ‘God will be all in all.’ This was the Alexandrian principle, which taught that matter originally flowed from the bosom of God, and which Origen has been considered as adopting in full extent. The principle well accords with several parts of his system, though we are not aware that he has any where expressly asserted it as regards the origin of matter. Beausobre thinks, that his real opinion was not that matter originally emanated from the substance of God; that all he meant to affirm was, that God never existed for a moment without exercising his perfections, and consequently without an act of creation; and that in this sense he supposed matter to be eternal. Upon the emanative principle it might be regarded as eternal, as proceeding from the bosom of the Eternal One. The Egyptian Platonists, who were Origen’s masters, admitted it to be eternal in this sense alone, thus departing from the dualistic system of the Athenian Sage. See Beausobre, *Histoire de Manichée et du Manichéisme*, T. II. pp. 284, 285. Also Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* T. III. p. 443, and Huet, *Origeniana*, Lib. II. c. II. Quæst. 2, § 24. Quæst. 12, § 2. To the learned labors of the latter especially, we acknowledge ourselves indebted for no little assistance in our attempt to collect and classify the opinions of Origen.

honor,' — were circumstances on which they dwelt with wonder, delight, and gratitude ; and they did not hesitate occasionally to bestow, on a being thus favored and exalted, some of the epithets of Divinity. Thus they sometimes call Christ, God, and Jewish usage fully sanctioned such an application of the term. Magistrates and judges are repeatedly denominated Gods in the old Testament, and our Saviour alludes to this application of the word as well known to the Jews ; John x. 35. It is not surprising that the primitive Christians, who as Jews, were familiar with this use of the term, should sometimes apply it to their master. Accustomed to hear the great and good prophets, judges, and magistrates of their nation called Gods, they would very naturally suppose that there could be no impiety in occasionally bestowing the title on Jesus, whose extraordinary birth, character, and offices were so fitted to inspire admiration and love. They never, however, thought of confounding him with the One Infinite Father, or making him in any sense his equal. The title in question was one of dignity and honor, applied primarily to the Supreme One, but in a secondary sense to beings inferior to him, to angels and men ; and this use of it was too common to occasion any surprise, error, or embarrassment.

But when Christianity, in the second century, began to number among its converts men wearing the garb, and claiming the character and name of philosophers, this simplicity of faith, which till then remained, became corrupted. Educated as Platonists of the Alexandrian school, these philosophers were familiar with the belief of a sort of second God, *logos*, or reason, originally emanating from the fountain of the Divinity. This doctrine they took along with them on embracing the religion of Jesus ; and misled by some obscure and figurative expressions employed by the Evangelists and Apostles, especially by John, they gradually incorporated it with the Christian system. Thus Jesus, who, before this time, had been called divine, and sometimes God, solely on account of his miraculous birth and exalted character and office, now began to be termed such in a different sense, that is, as a being from eternity existing in God, not personally, but as an attribute, as his reason, wisdom, or energy ; which, a little before the creation of the world, was emitted, or thrown out, that is, converted into a real being or person, a kind of second God. After this event, he became, as these Fathers imagined, a be-

ing wholly distinct from God, was inferior to him, and his agent in forming and governing the world. They never apply to him the title 'God over all'; never ascribe to him supreme divinity. They did not suppose him eternal, except as an attribute of the Father. He existed in God, as reason exists in us, so existed from eternity, a mere quality or attribute. He was produced, that is, became a real being, when God, being about to create the world, had occasion to use his ministrations. Thus, as an attribute, he was, in their view, eternal; as a person, or being, he was not so, having been begotten or made (for they originally used both terms) in time. This is what these Fathers meant by the generation of the Son, which, as we have seen, was regarded by them as temporal, not as eternal.

The *logos*, or Son, being then produced, afterwards became incarnate, was made flesh, and became susceptible of suffering, and, as they thought, actually suffered, in his whole nature. To suppose that part of his nature was exempt from suffering, though deemed orthodox now, was then pronounced heresy.

Such is a general view of the doctrine of the Fathers, who were converts from Platonism, during the second and third centuries. This doctrine, which contains the germ of the trinity, was introduced into the Church, as we have satisfactorily shown, we trust, on a former occasion,* by Justin Martyr, who wrote about the middle of the second century. We shall now adduce evidence to prove that it was held by subsequent Fathers down to the time of Origen.

We will begin with Tatian, the Syrian, who was a disciple of Justin, and who flourished near the end of the second century. In language similar to that employed by his master, he describes God alone as without beginning, invisible, ineffable, the Author of all things visible and invisible,† epithets uniformly applied by Justin and the early Christian writers, to the Father, and never to the Son. He speaks of God's power as the 'beginning of the *logos*,' or Son. Considered in relation to the world not as yet actually existing, he was, says Tatian, *alone*. 'But in regard to his power, by which he

* Vol. II. pp. 303—328, New Series, where we introduced a discussion on the subject of the Origin of the Trinity.

† *Contra Græcos Oratio*.

was the cause of all things, visible and invisible, all things were *with him* ;' that is, as he had the power of producing them. 'With him, by virtue of his rational power,' or as he was a rational being, 'the *logos* which was in him, subsisted' : that is, potentially, as he had the power of producing it. By a simple act of his will, his '*logos* leaped out from him, being his first begotten work,'* or beginning of the creation. From this and similar language, it is evident, that Tatian considered the *logos*, or Son, as originally, and from eternity in and with God, not as a real being or person, but only as an attribute, or by virtue of his power of producing it ; in him and with him, only, as all things created were, by his power of voluntarily producing them. This, indeed, he asserts almost in so many words. He speaks of the Son as having a beginning, that is, considered as a real subsistence or person ; and he evidently regarded him, after his production, as a being distinct from the Father, and inferior to him. The Son was produced by the Father, he tells us, as one torch is lighted from another, or as speech is produced in us from the faculty of speech within us, illustrations which were common with the Fathers, and imply a numerical distinction of being and essence. This distinction is expressly asserted by Justin, Tatian's master, who contends, in words as plain and unequivocal as language affords, that the Father and Son are two in number, two beings, the one visible, the other invisible, the one remaining fixed in his place, the other capable of motion from place to place ; and Tatian obviously trod in his steps.

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, and contemporary with Tatian, taught the same doctrine. He speaks of God as Supreme, the 'true and only God,' 'without beginning,' 'invisible,' 'unbegotten,' and as such immutable, and finally as 'incapable of being comprehended in space' ; and of the Son as inferior, having, as a real being, or person, a beginning, 'visible,' 'begotten,' and therefore, according to his philosophy,† not possessing the attribute of immutability, which belonged

* *Contra Græcos Oratio*, pp. 246 – 248, ed. Paris. annexed to the works of Justin Martyr, Paris, 1742. This edition of Justin contains, also, the writings which are extant, of Theophilus of Antioch, and Athenagoras. In citing these authors, our references are uniformly made to this edition.

† *Ad Autolycum*, Lib. I. pp. 149 – 280.

only to the unbegotten One, and lastly, as 'contained in space,' and capable of locomotion. He describes him as originally not *with* God as a separate subsistence, but *in* him, as an attribute, that is, his *logos*, reason, or wisdom; but, says he, 'God, when about to make those things he had designed, begat this *logos*, producing, or throwing him out, the first-born of every creature.'* Thus he became a real being, subject to the will of the Father, and was employed by him as his instrument in making the worlds. Afterwards, when it pleased the Father, he was commissioned by him to go from place to place, where he was 'heard and seen.' He entered Paradise, and conversed with Adam and Eve, not in his own person, but in the 'person of the Father and Lord of all,' and was visible in a circumscribed space.† He is thus plainly distinguished from the supreme and unbegotten God.

Again, Theophilus contends expressly that the 'one only and true God,' by whom he always understands the Father, is alone to be 'worshipped.'‡ But it is unnecessary to adduce further evidence of his views of the Son, whom he evidently regarded as born, or produced from the reason of the Father, a little before the creation of the world, thus becoming a distinct being, subject to the will of the Father, and not entitled to equal adoration.§

Theophilus was the first Christian writer who used the term 'trinity,' in reference to the Deity, but it is deserving of remark that the three 'distinctions,' or three 'somewhats,' to adopt the modern phraseology, designated by it, are, according to him, 'God, his *logos*, and his wisdom.' By *wisdom*, we suppose we are here to understand the Spirit, though in

* Ad Autol. Lib. II. p. 365. See also p. 355.

† Lib. II. p. 365.

‡ Lib. I. p. 345.

§ When Theophilus speaks of God, as consulting his *logos*, or wisdom, before the generation of the Son, he evidently uses a figurative mode of expression. So a man is said to take counsel of his understanding, or of his affections; he consults his sense of duty, or his inclination, but no one supposes this phraseology to imply that the understanding, or affections, or conscience, are real beings, persons. Such expressions are familiar in all languages, and they serve to explain what is meant by the early Fathers, when they speak of God as consulting his *logos*, reason, or wisdom, before the event called by them the generation of the Son. The phraseology is not of a nature to create the least embarrassment. Every school-boy knows better than to construe it as implying an actual consultation between real beings.

the theology of the Fathers, it was generally considered as synonymous with the *logos* or word. It was often, however, confounded with the Spirit.*

Athenagoras, a learned Athenian, also flourished near the end of the second century; and from two short pieces of his, which are extant, it appears that he was equally careful with the writers above quoted, to preserve the supremacy of the Father, and entertained similar views of the origin and rank of the Son. He calls him the 'mind, intellect, and *logos* of the Father,' the 'first progeny of the Father.' 'God,' he tells us, 'always had in himself *logos*, or reason, being always rational.' Hence sprang the Son, from an attribute becoming a person, or being, whom the Father used as his instrument in forming the world. Thus he was regarded by Athenagoras as distinct and subordinate.†

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, also wrote late in the second century, and has left on record a summary of the faith

* So, too, they often confounded the Spirit with the *logos*, adhering to the old Jewish phraseology, but attributing to it an entirely new sense. Thus in Psalm xxxiii. 6. 'By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the *breath* of his mouth,' or *spirit*, the two terms, *word* and *spirit*, are used to express the same thing, that is, a divine operation. There is no allusion whatever to persons, or separate agents, but only to a mode of divine agency. Such was the Jewish sense of the terms, and in this sense they were synonymous. When the Platonizing Fathers had affixed a new sense to the term *logos*, or *word*, considering it as designating a real person, they still for a time retained former Jewish modes of expression, though utterly at variance with their system. Thus they speak indiscriminately of the Spirit and *logos* as inspiring the prophets, and of the Spirit, or power of God, or *logos*, as overshadowing the Virgin. According to the sense the Jews attributed to those terms, there was no inconsistency in this use of them, the breath, spirit, power, or word of the Lord, being only different modes of expressing a divine influence, or act of power. But when the *logos*, or word, came to be considered a person or being, distinct from the Father and Spirit, whether the last was regarded as a person or an influence, the phraseology became absurd. The Fathers, however, continued to use it occasionally from the effect of habit. The history of the phraseology in question, the signification it bore in the writings of the Jews, its inconsistency with the doctrine of the Fathers, though from custom they continued to employ it, afford, to our minds, conclusive evidence, had we no other, that they were innovators. The doctrine of the trinity was as yet very imperfectly formed; as it became further advanced, the phraseology alluded to was gradually dropped.

† Legat. pro Christ. See particularly pp. 282 - 284, and 286, 287.

of Christians of his time, in which we discover no trace of the doctrines of modern orthodoxy.* Like the philosophical converts of the second and third centuries generally, he believed, unquestionably, that the Son had a sort of metaphysical existence in the Father, as an attribute from eternity, but he is very careful, on all occasions, to distinguish him from the 'one true and only God,' who is 'over all,' and 'besides whom there is no other.' The Father 'sends,' the Son is 'sent;' the Father 'commands,' the Son ministers to his will, and was his instrument in making the world. These and similar expressions, which form his current phraseology, and, in fact, are interwoven with the texture of his whole work 'Against Heresies,' would not have been employed by one, who conceived of the Son as partaking of the numerical essence of the Father, or as in any sense his equal.

Again, he quotes the words of our Saviour, Mark xiii, 32, 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,' without any attempt to explain them away, or evade the obvious inference. He admits their truth in the simplest and broadest sense, and thence deduces an argument for humility. 'If the Son,' says he, 'did not blush to refer the knowledge of that day to the Father, neither do we blush to reserve the solution of difficult questions to God.'† He goes further. Far from denying the consequence we should derive from the expression referred to, he expressly admits it. Our Saviour, he observes, used this expression, 'that we might learn from him, that the Father is over all; for, the Father, he says, is greater than I.'‡ The doctrine of two natures, by the help of which modern Trinitarians attempt to evade the force of this and similar passages, was not as yet invented. Irenæus very honestly understood the words of our Saviour according to their obvious, and, we add, necessary import; and thus understood, we perceive, they taught nothing which militated against his views of the nature and rank of the Saviour.

Irenæus has another class of expressions which show that he never thought of attributing to the Son an equality with the Father. He describes his power, dignity, and titles, as derived from the gift of the Father. Thus, 'he *received* do-

* Adv. Hær. Lib. i. c. 2, 3. See also Lib. iii. c. 1 & 4.

† Lib. ii. c. 48.

‡ Ib. c. 49.

minion of the Father.' 'The Father *gave* him the heritage of the nations,' 'subjected all his enemies to him,' and hence he is entitled to be called 'Lord.' But it is unnecessary to multiply quotations.

Irenæus evidently believed that Jesus Christ suffered in his whole nature. There were some Christians of his time of the sect of Gnostics, who maintained that a certain exalted intelligence, called Christ, descended on Jesus at his baptism, and left him and reascended at his crucifixion. This opinion he strenuously combats, as taking away the Saviour, who, according to this hypothesis, was neither incarnate nor died, the man Jesus alone having suffered; thus clearly intimating his belief, that Jesus Christ was not in any part of his nature impassible. Again, he says, 'Jesus, who suffered for us, is the *logos* of God,' whence we may infer that he supposed him to have suffered in his most exalted nature.* It is hence quite obvious that he did not regard him as one in essence with God.

We come next to Tertullian, a Latin Father, who flourished about the year 200. His testimony on the points under consideration, is even more full and explicit than that of Irenæus. He has transmitted three creeds, or summaries of the belief of Christians in his time,† similar in sentiment, though differing somewhat in expression. All these teach the supremacy of the Father, a doctrine, in fact, which stands prominent in all the writings of Tertullian, especially in his treatises against Hermogenes and Praxeas. We might fill page after page with expressions in which it is either directly asserted, or necessarily implied. Thus he is the 'One Supreme, of whom are all things,' 'who made all things by the

* Lib. i. c. 1, 25. Lib. iii. c. 11, § 1. He sometimes, indeed, speaks of the *logos* as quiescent during the crucifixion, though the train of his reasoning, as we have seen, evidently implies his belief that the whole Christ suffered. To the intelligent reader it will occur, that if this reasoning was good against the followers of Cerinthus, and others of his time, it is equally conclusive against a doctrine of modern orthodoxy. The Orthodox of modern ages, in fact, virtually occupy the place of the heretics in the days of Irenæus. The former teach that Christ suffered only in his human nature, and this was condemned by the early Fathers as a denial of the Saviour. But there are strange revolutions in human opinion.

† De Præscrip. Hæret. c. 13. Adv. Prax. c. 2. De Virg. Veland.

instrumentality of his word,' 'without beginning,' and who 'has no equal.'*

Tertullian admits that the Son is entitled to be called God, on the principle that 'whatever is born of God is God,' just as one born of human parents is human. He speaks of him as possessing 'unity of substance' with God; but by this and similar phrases, as the learned well know, the Ante-Nicene Fathers never meant to express a numerical unity of essence, but only a specific, that is a common, nature. Thus all human beings, as such, are of one substance; the son is of one substance with the father. In this sense Tertullian evidently uses the phrase in question, as he immediately proceeds to explain. For, after saying that the Son has 'unity of substance' with God, he adds, 'for God is spirit,' and, 'from spirit is produced spirit, from God, God, from light, light.'† Thus he supposed the Son to be in some sort divine by virtue of his birth, and of one substance with God, as he is a spirit, and God is spirit. At the same time he regarded him as a different being from the Father, that is, numerically distinct from him. This, all his illustrations imply, and moreover he expressly affirms it. 'The Son,' he says, 'is derived from God, as the branch from the root, the stream from the fountain, the ray from the sun.' 'The root and the branch are two *things*, though conjoined; and the fountain and the stream are two *species*, though undivided; and the sun and its ray are two forms, though cohering.'‡ And so, according to him, God and Christ are two *things*, two *species*, two *forms*. Things 'conjoined,' or 'cohering,' must necessarily be two. We do not use the terms of one individual substance. Again, alluding to John i. 1, he says, 'There is one who was, and another with whom he was.'§ Again, he observes, 'He who begets is different from him who is begotten; he who *sends*, from him who is sent.'|| Again, alluding to 1 Cor. xv, 27, 28, he says, 'From this passage of the Apostolical Epistle, it may be shown that the Father and Son are two, not only from a difference in name, but from the fact, that he who delivers a kingdom, and he to whom it is delivered, he who subjects, and he who receives in subjection, are necessarily two.'¶

* Adv. Marcionem, L. i. c. 3. Adv. Hermog. c. 4. See also references in the preceding note.

† Apol. adv. Gentes. c. 21.

‡ Adv. Prax. c. 8.

§ Ib. c. 13.

|| Ib. c. 29.

¶ Ib. c. 4.

That he regarded the Son as inferior, is evident from the following declarations. He was produced by the Father. 'The Lord created me,' as he quotes from the Septuagint, 'the beginning of his ways.' Prov. viii, 22. Thus he was the first of all beings produced, 'the beginning' of the creation, the first work of God, who, as Tertullian adds, being about to form the world, 'produced the *word*, that by him, as his instrument, he might make the universe.'* 'The Father,' he says, 'is a whole substance, the Son a derivation, and portion of the whole, as he professes, saying, "The Father is greater than I,"'† which Tertullian understands according to the literal import of the terms. He speaks of God as the 'head of Christ,' and of the latter as deriving all his power and titles from the former. Thus he is 'most high, *because* by the right hand of God exalted, as Peter declares, Acts ii, 24, Lord of hosts, *because* all things are subjected to him by the Father.'‡ He 'does nothing except by the will of the Father, having received all power from him.'§ And hence Tertullian contends the supremacy of the Father, or monarchy, as he calls it, which the innovations of the learned Platonizing Christians were thought by the more simple and unlettered to impair, is preserved, the Son having received from the Father the kingdom, which he is hereafter to restore.

Tertullian, though he admits the preëxistence of the Son, expressly denies his eternity. 'There was a time,' he tells us, 'when the Son was not.'|| Again, 'Before all things, God was alone, himself a world, and place, and all things to himself.' That is, as he explains it, nothing existed without, or beyond himself. 'Yet he was not alone, for he had his own reason, which was in himself, with him. For God is rational,' a being endued with reason. This reason, or *logos*, as it was called by the Greeks, he proceeds to tell us, was afterwards converted into the Word, or Son, that is, a real being, having existed, from eternity, only as an attribute of the Father.¶ The whole passage is exceedingly curious, but is too long for quotation. We might multiply extracts without number; but enough has been said to show, that Tertullian believed the Son to be, in reality, a distinct being from the Father, inferior to him, deriving from him his being

* Adv. Prax. c. 6.

† Ib. c. 9.

‡ Ib. c. 17.

§ Ib. c. 4.

|| Adv. Hermog. c. 3.

¶ Adv. Prax. c. 5.

and power, subject in all things to his will, and one with him, as he partook of a similar spiritual and divine nature, and was united with him in affection and purpose.*

We come lastly to the celebrated Clement of Alexandria, the master of Origen. Clement devoted himself with ardor to the study of the popular philosophy, and derived from it a multitude of absurd dogmas, of which, by the help of the allegorical method of interpretation, for which he was a strenuous advocate, he persuaded himself he discovered the germs in the sacred writings. Plato, he conceived, had originally stolen them from Moses,† and it was right to reclaim them. With his opinions, however, except on the subject of the trinity, we have at present no concern. None of the Platonizing Fathers, before Origen, have acknowledged the inferiority of the Son in more explicit terms. Photius is angry with him for ‘depressing the Son to the rank of a creature,’ and using ‘other impious words full of blasphemy,’ in a work which has since perished. Rufinus, too, charges him with calling the ‘Son of God a creature.’‡ In his *Stromata*, he calls ‘Wisdom,’ that is, the Son, the ‘first-created of God,’§ the ‘beginning of the universe,’ that is, the first production of God, by whom he made all things. He speaks of Christ as subject to the Father, and acting by his will and command. He acknowledges the Father to be ‘Supreme,’ the ‘one unbegotten God,’ and says, in his address to the Gentiles, whom he urges to conversion, ‘You shall sing with angels around the unbegotten, ever living, and only true God, the *logos* of God *hymning with us*.’ Such language could be used only by one who believed God and the Son to be numerically distinct, in other words, two beings, the one supreme, and the other subordinate, the first-born of all created intelligences,

* Adv. Prax. c. 22.

† ‘Plato,’ he tells us, ‘learned geometry of the Egyptians, astronomy of the Babylonians, song of the Thracians, but derived his laws and divinity from the Hebrews.’ ‘Who is Plato,’ he asks, in another place, ‘but Moses Atticizing?’ The Mosaic and the Platonic philosophy, or divinity, if we may call it such, however, were essentially and radically different, and, as combined by the Fathers, formed a most unnatural union. It is very clear, therefore, that they were mistaken in supposing that he borrowed from the Hebrew lawgiver, or that his philosophy was, as they supposed, shadowed forth in the books of the Old Testament.

‡ Jerome, Apol. adv. Rufin. Lib. II.

§ Lib. v.

and with them, as their elder brother, hymning hallelujahs around the throne of the One Infinite Father.

He calls the Son, or *logos*, the 'image of God,' as man is the 'image of the Son'; again, his 'hand,' or instrument. He describes God as the 'original and sole author of eternal life, which the Son,' he says, 'receiving of God, gives to us.' He makes the great requisite to eternal life to be, 'to know God, eternal, giver of eternal blessings, and first, and supreme, and one, and good, and then the greatness of the Saviour after him,'* according to the declaration of Jesus, 'This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' John xvii, 3.

We have thus adduced evidence, not so ample as we might, but as ample as is needed, to show that the strict and proper inferiority of the Son, was a doctrine of all the principal Fathers from Justin Martyr, A.D. 130, to Origen, A.D. 240; that they had, however, departed from the doctrine of the primitive Christians, who regarded him as divine only by virtue of his miraculous birth, and the dignity of his character and office; that, seduced by a love of the reigning philosophy, they ascribed to him a sort of metaphysical existence from eternity, not as a real being, or person, but as an attribute of the Father, his reason, or wisdom; that they regarded him as produced, begotten, or made, (for they use all these terms,) in time, and the agent of the Father in forming the world; and finally, that some, if not all of them, believed, that he suffered in his whole nature,† and deemed a denial of this, heresy.

We are now prepared to return to Origen. Like the preceding Fathers, he regarded the Son as the first production of the Father, having emanated from him as light from the sun, and thus partaking of the same substance, that is, a divine. He believed, however, that God and the Son constituted two individual essences, two beings. This belief he distinctly avows in more than one instance, and the general strain of his writings implies it. He disclaims being of the number of

* Quis Dives Salv.

† So Clement seems to have thought, as well as Irenæus and others. The believers of his simple humanity they allowed to be Christians; the believers of an impassible nature, as before observed, they condemned as heretics. From the former, Justin Martyr simply expresses his dissent; for the latter, as they arose, subsequent Fathers express their abhorrence.

those, 'who deny that the Father and Son are two substances'; and proceeds to assert that they 'are two things as to their essence, but one in consent, concord, and identity of will.'* He quotes the Saviour, 'I and my Father are one,' which he explains as referring solely to unity of will and affection, and refers, in illustration, to Acts iv, 32, 'And the multitude of them that believed, were of one heart and one soul.'† Again, from the circumstance that Jesus is called 'light,' in the Gospel of John, i. 4, 5, 9, and in his Epistle, 1 John, i. 5, God is said to be 'light,' some, he observes, may infer, that 'the Father does not differ from the Son in essence.' But this inference, he proceeds to say, would be wrong. For, 'the light, which shines in darkness, and is not comprehended by it, is not the same with that in which there is no darkness at all.' The Father and the Son, he then says, are 'two lights.'‡ This, surely, is not the reasoning of a Trinitarian. Once more, he expresses his disapprobation of the hypothesis, that 'the Spirit has no proper essence diverse from the Father and Son,' and adds, 'We believe that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three essences, or three substances.'§

Let us next hear what he says of the *inferiority* of the Son. Jerome, who had access to several of his works, which are now lost, or have come down to us in a corrupt and mutilated form, accuses him of saying, that 'the Son was not begotten, but made'; that, 'compared with the Father, he is a very small light, which appears great to us on account of our feebleness.' Again, Origen, he says, 'takes the example of two images, a larger and smaller; of which, one fills the world, and becomes in some sort invisible by its magnitude; the other falls within the limits of distinct vision. To the former, he compares the Father, to the latter, the Son.' He

* Cont. Cels. L. viii. 'Two in essence.' The term in the original is *hypostasis*, essence. In this sense, it was always used by the early Fathers, and not in the modern sense. 'Υπόστασις pro οὐσία priscis temporibus solebat usurpari ab Ethnicis et Christianis,' says Huet. 'Hieronymus, Epist. 57, ad Damas. *Tota sæcularium literarum schola nihil aliud hypostasin nisi oḡsian novit.* Ita sumpserunt Nicæni Patres, ita Sardicenses.' Orig. L. ii. c. ii. Quæst. 2, § 3. That such was the meaning of the term, as used by the ancient Fathers, admits of no dispute. So Brucker, Petavius, Du Pin, and the learned Trinitarians generally decide.

† Ib.

‡ Comment. in Joan. T. ii. Opp. T. iv. p. 76.

§ Ib. p. 61.

attributes, continues Jerome, 'perfect goodness' only to the 'Omnipotent Father,' and does not allow 'the Son to be good,' that is, in an absolute sense, 'but only a certain breath and image of goodness.' *

But let us listen to Origen himself. In his commentaries on John, he pronounces 'God, the *logos*,' or Son, to be 'surpassed by the God of the Universe.' † Commenting on John i, 3, 'All things were made by him,' he observes, that the particle *by*, or *through*, (*διὰ*) is never referred to the primary agent, but only to the secondary and subordinate, and he takes as an example, Heb. i, 2, 'By whom also he made the worlds,' or ages. By this expression, he says, Paul meant to teach us, that 'God made the ages by the Son,' as an instrument. So he adds, in the place under consideration, 'If all things were made (*διὰ*) through the *logos*, or Son, they were not made (*ὑπὸ*) by him,' that is, as the primary cause, 'but by a greater and better,' and who can that be, but the Father'? ‡ Again, Jesus is called the 'true light,' and 'in proportion as God, the Father of truth, is greater than truth, and the Father of wisdom is more noble and excellent than wisdom, in the same proportion,' says Origen, 'he excels the true light.' § Again, the Son and Spirit, he says, 'are excelled by the Father as much, or more, than they excel other beings.' 'He is in no respect to be compared with the Father. For he is the image of his goodness, and the effulgence, not of God, but of his glory, and of his eternal light, and a ray, not of the Father, but of his power, and a pure emanation of his most powerful glory, and spotless mirror of his energy.' || Again, 'the Father who sent him [Jesus] is alone good, and greater than he who was sent.' ¶

Again, Origen contends that Christ is not the object of supreme worship, and that prayer, properly such, ought never to be addressed to him, but is to be offered to the God of the Universe, through his only-begotten Son, who, as our intercessor and high priest, bears our petitions to the throne of his Father and our Father, of his God and our God. On this subject, he is very full and explicit. 'Prayer is not to be directed,' he says, 'to one begotten, not even to Christ himself, but to the God and Father of the Universe alone, to

* Epist. 94, al. 59, ad Avitum.

† Ib. p. 60.

§ Ib. p. 76.

‡ Opp. Tom. iv. p. 53.

|| Ib. pp. 235, 236.

¶ Ib. p. 139.

whom also our Saviour prayed, and to whom he teaches us to pray. When his disciples said, "Teach us to pray," he taught them to pray, not to himself, but to the Father, saying, "Our Father, who art in heaven." For, if the Son,' he continues, 'be different from the Father in essence, as we have proved in another place, we must either pray to the Son, and not to the Father, or to both, or to the Father alone. But no one is so absurd as to maintain that we are to pray to the Son, and not to the Father. If prayer is addressed to both, we ought to use the plural number, and say, "Forgive, bless, preserve *ye* us," or something like it. But as this is not a fit mode of address, and no example of it occurs in the Scriptures, it remains that we pray to the Father of the Universe alone.' He adds, 'But as he who would pray as he ought, must not pray to him who himself prays, but to him whom Jesus our Lord taught us to invoke in prayer, namely, the Father, so no prayer is to be offered to the Father without him; which he clearly shows when he says, John xvi. 23, 24, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he shall give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." For he does not say, Ask me, nor, Ask the Father, simply; but, "If ye shall ask the Father in my name, he shall give it you." For until Jesus had thus taught them, no one had asked the Father in the name of the Son, and what he said was true, "Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name."' And again, 'What are we to infer,' asks Origen, 'from the question, "Why call ye me good?" There is none good but one, God the Father.' What, but that he meant to say, Why pray to me? It is proper to pray to the Father alone, to whom I pray, as ye learn from the Scriptures. For ye ought not to pray to him who is constituted by the Father high priest for you, and who has received the office of advocate from the Father, but through the high priest and advocate, who can be touched with the feeling of your infirmities, having been tempted in all respects as ye are, but, by the gift of the Father, tempted without sin. Learn, therefore, how great a gift ye have received of my Father, having obtained, through generation in me, the spirit of adoption, by which ye have a title to be called the sons of God, and my brethren; as I said to the Father concerning you, by the mouth of David, "I will declare thy name to my brethren,

in the midst of the assembly I will sing praise to thee." But it is not according to reason for a brother to be addressed in prayer by those who are glorified by the same Father. Ye are to pray to the Father alone, with and through me.*

This we take to be sound Unitarianism. Indeed the question of the impropriety of addressing the Son in prayer, could not have been better argued by the most strenuous advocate for the divine unity at the present day.

We have thus shown, as we think, conclusively, that Origen believed God and the Son to be two essences, two substances, two beings; that he placed the Son at an immense distance from the Infinite One, and was strongly impressed with the impropriety of addressing him in prayer, strictly so called; that he viewed him, however, as standing at the head of all God's offspring, and with them, and for them, as his younger brethren, whom he had been appointed to teach and to save, offering prayer at the throne of the Eternal.

To the Spirit, Origen assigned a place below the Son, by whom, according to him, it was made. To the Spirit, the office of redeeming the human race properly pertained; but it being incompetent to so great a work, the Son, who alone was adequate to accomplish it, engaged.† The Father, he says, pervades all things; the Son, only beings endowed with reason; and the Holy Spirit, only the sanctified, or saved.

It had been a prevalent philosophical notion, that man possessed both a rational and a sensitive soul; but this notion was now becoming obsolete, and the spirit, and soul, or sensitive principle, were often confounded. The latter, the Platonizing Fathers, before the time of Origen, ascribed to Christ, but not, as we are persuaded, the former, or rational soul. The place of this was supplied, as they thought, by the *logos*.‡ Ori-

* De Orat. Opp. T. i. pp. 222, 223. See also Cont. Cels. L. v, § 4, p. 580. L. viii, § 13, p. 751. ib. § 26, p. 761.

† Comment. in Joan. T. ii. Opp. T. iv. p. 60 - 63. Jerome Epist. 94, ad Avitum.

‡ Dr. Priestley thinks differently, supposing the ancient doctrine to have been that the *logos* was united with a 'proper human soul,' by which he means the rational principle. But we are not satisfied with the evidence he offers in support of his position, as regards the Fathers who preceded Origen. We think that he has not been sufficiently attentive to the distinction above alluded to, between the rational and the sensitive soul, the latter of which is intended by the Fathers in question, when they speak of Christ as consisting of 'a body, *logos*, and

gen's views on this subject, however, appear to have been peculiar. He supposed that the *logos*, or divine nature of Christ, became united with a human rational soul before his incarnation. He believed all souls to be preëxistent, all endowed with freedom. Of these souls, which, from the moment of their production, were placed in a state of probation, one having used well its liberty, was, on account of its distinguished sanctity, taken into union with the *logos*, or Son, and became one spirit with it, one substance. This union, as Origen supposed, prepared the way for a future union with flesh, a divine nature being incapable of union with body without some medium.* The soul, thus honored, was selected, as just intimated, for its merits. Retaining its immaculate purity, and love to its Maker, it was rewarded by being raised into union with the divine *logos*; and we, as Origen further taught, if we imitate the singular love of Christ to God, shall be made partakers of the same *logos*, and, in proportion to our merits, be taken into union with it.†

It is not easy to determine precisely what views Origen

soul,' ψυχῆ. Such is the expression of Justin Martyr. This error, as we deem it, of Dr. Priestley, was associated with another, which is, that the early Fathers believed that Christ did not suffer in his whole nature. But the course of reasoning they pursue, as before observed, often implies their belief that he did so suffer; besides, they sometimes speak of a suffering *logos*, though, it is true, solitary expressions may be quoted from their writings, which appear, at first view, to favor the opposite supposition. We think that Dr. Priestley, in general so fair, suffered his decisions, in the present case, to be influenced, unconsciously, by the character of his theological views. He seems to have felt more solicitude than we feel, to deprive the doctrine of Arius of support from the philosophical opinions of the second and third centuries, and to trace in the opinions of the Platonizing Fathers, what he conceived, with or without reason, to have been the original doctrine of the simple humanity. The doctrine of Arius, as we hope, on some future occasion, to be able to show, was undoubtedly an innovation, but not, we think, to the extent Dr. Priestley appears to have supposed. In denying that Christ possessed a human rational soul, he trod, we conceive, in the footsteps of the early philosophical, though not of the ancient uneducated, Christians.

* De Princip. Lib. ii. c. 6.

† Delarue has attempted, we think, without success, to prove that doctrines, so fraught with difficulties as the above, would never have been held by Origen. But Origen was not much in the habit of rejecting opinions on account of their apparent extravagance. Besides, the doctrines alluded to, are, in their essential features, in perfect harmony with his whole system, especially with his views of free will and merit.

entertained of the *nature* of the efficacy of Christ's death. He speaks of it much in the style of the sacred writers, that is, he is satisfied to use very general terms, which admit of great latitude of construction. The expressions he employs on the subject, are, consequently, wholly unlike the language adopted by the modern advocates for the doctrine of the atonement, nor do the notions conveyed by this language ever appear to have occurred to his mind.* He certainly did not hold what are now, with singular infelicity, called the 'doctrines of grace,' sometimes the 'evangelical doctrines,' or 'doctrines of Calvinism.' Of these doctrines, no trace is to be found in this learned Father. On the contrary, his writings furnish an armory, from which may be drawn weapons, effectually to combat them.

He frequently alludes to the subject of the sufferings and cross of Christ, but not more frequently, we think, than the adherents of a rational faith at the present day, nor does he urge it with more warmth and earnestness. If there is any difference, it is not greater than would naturally be produced by the different situation of the writers, and character of the times. The 'reproach of the cross' was perpetually objected to Christians, by unbelievers of the early ages; and the Apologists for Christianity, in the true spirit of St. Paul, did not hesitate, on all fit occasions, to testify that what to the 'Greeks' seemed 'foolishness,' was to them matter of 'glorying.' Origen, like the other Fathers, was fond of regarding Christ as the light, the guide, and pattern of the human soul; as its purifier, its redeemer, and Saviour, as well by his teachings as by his death. He was the wisdom of the Father, and the image of his goodness and truth; as such, it was his appropriate office to shed light on the human spirit, and, by infusing into it all holy and godlike affections, to prepare it for a final union with the great Source of being, of light, and

* From the manner in which he sometimes expresses himself, it would seem that he did not attribute to the death of Christ an efficacy peculiar in kind, but only in extent. 'Perhaps,' says he, 'as we are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, he having received,' as the reward of his sufferings, 'a name above every name, so some will be redeemed by the precious blood of martyrs, their martyrdom contributing also to their exaltation.' Exhort. ad Martyrium. Opp. T. I. p. 309. Again, 'Jesus laid down his life for us, and let us lay down ours, I will not say, for him, but for ourselves, and for those who may be edified by our martyrdom.' Ib. p. 301.

enjoyment. So Origen viewed him; and the language in which he spoke of him partook not of that narrow, jejune, and technical character, which has but too often marked the discourses and writings of Christians of later ages.

With regard to the *extent* of the benefits intended to be conveyed by the death of Christ, Origen entertained some very singular, and, as will be admitted by all, exceedingly wild and visionary notions. But, to enable our readers readily to comprehend his opinions, or, perhaps, his conjectures, on this subject, we must first make them acquainted with his views of the great system of rational and animated natures, comprehending angels, men, and demons; sun, moon, and stars. Those views, it will be perceived, were derived from the very fanciful philosophy of the age; and though they may constitute bad theology, they are entitled, some of them at least, to our admiration, as beautiful creations of a poetic imagination.

All beings endowed with reason, according to Origen, are of one nature, or essence,* and were produced long before the foundation of the visible world. In this opinion, he was not singular. The preëxistence of souls was a dogma of the reigning philosophy. At first, as Origen maintained, they were pure intelligences, all glowing with love to their Maker. They, however, possessed entire freedom, and the capacity of virtue and vice. The consequence was, their primeval love grew cold, and they became in various degrees estranged from God, the fountain and centre of moral life and heat. They were hence reduced to different ranks of beings, and doomed to occupy different stations, more or less exalted or depressed, according to their acquired character and habits;

* All beings endowed with reason; including, according to Jerome, 'the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Angels, Powers, Dominations, and other Virtues'; all these, says Jerome, he asserted to be of one substance, though, at other times, he would not allow the Son to be of the same substance with the Father, dreading the appearance of impiety. Epist. 95, ad Avit. The expression, 'of one substance,' or one essence, which is here employed by Origen, in reference to God, angels, and the souls of men, is deserving of notice, as it is precisely that which is often employed by the Fathers in speaking of God and the Son. The inference is obvious.

Origen 'does not hesitate' says Jerome, 'to ascribe the nature of the omnipotent God to angels and men.' And why should he refuse to ascribe it to the Son? Yet he did sometimes refuse from a principle of piety, so careful was he not to infringe the Divine Unity.

and this visible, material world, was created for their reception.

Some were placed in the bodies of the sun and stars, and were appointed to the noble office of enlightening and adorning the universe, and continue to shine with greater or less splendor, according to their moral merits. The stars are thus animated, endowed with reason, and have partaken of sin. They receive the commands of God, and move in their prescribed courses; they still retain the attribute of freedom; their virtue is capable of increase or diminution, and they will hereafter be judged. They are able, by their positions and aspects, to prefigure future events; and apostate spirits, deriving their knowledge from them, transmitted the arts of astrology to man.*

Of others, was formed the community of angels, who, according to Origen, are clothed with light, ethereal vehicles, to which, in consistency with the philosophical tenets in which he was reared, he seemed inclined to add bodies of a grosser sort, thus making them compound beings, like man, consisting of body and soul. He assigns them various offices. He sometimes speaks of each individual of our race, as constantly attended by a good and bad angel. Christians, especially, enjoy the benefit of a tutelar spirit, but whether appointed at their birth, or baptism, he does not afford us the means of determining. Some preside over communities, and churches, and hence we hear of the 'angels of the churches,' in the Revelation; some over inanimate objects, the operations of nature, human inventions, and arts; over plants and animals; each having received the charge for which he is, by disposition, best fitted, regard being had to his merit or demerit in a preëxistent state. Thus Raphael is the patron of the medical art; to Gabriel are assigned the affairs of war; and to Michael, for his piety, the offering of the prayers of the saints. † They assist in transmitting souls into bodies, in disengaging them at death, in conducting them to judgment. Like the souls of stars, they retain their freedom, and will be rewarded or punished, for the use or abuse of their liberty. Finally, they are entitled to a degree of reverence and worship, corresponding to their nature and offices, though we must be careful not to confound the regard which is their due, with

* Comment. in Gen. Opp. T. II. p. 9.

† De Princip. L. I. c. 8.

the supreme adoration due to God, who alone is to be addressed in prayer.*

The more guilty spirits were depressed into the rank of demons, who possess bodies far grosser than those of angels, as, in their prior state, they contracted greater impurity. These, too, retain their moral liberty, are still capable of virtue, and may yet

‘reascend,
Self-raised, and repossess their native seat.’

Others were destined to become human souls, and, for the punishment of their sins, were imprisoned in bodies of flesh, and are subjected to the discipline best fitted for their recovery.

Such, according to this Father, is the general system of rational natures. All existed in a prior state; all were made capable of virtue or vice, but, abusing their liberty, were degraded from a superior to inferior orders of beings. Some became angels, and some demons; some the souls of sun, moon, and stars; and some were imprisoned in bodies of flesh.† The present condition of all, is the result of their conduct in a former state of trial; it is a state of punishment and continued probation; they are still capable of recovering themselves, are still free. By new sin, or new virtue, they may be still further depressed, or rise; they may regain a higher order, and again relapse, and sink; from men become angels, and from angels, men.

We are now prepared to resume the subject of the *extent* of the benefits ascribed by Origen to the death of the Saviour.

* From the above account of the offices attributed to angels, we perceive how completely the heathen notion of tutelar spirits and genii was transferred to Christianity. According to the splendid mythology of the Pagans, every grove, temple, stream, and fountain, all seasons and arts, business and pleasure, had their presiding deities. Christianity banished these false divinities from the earth, but in the theology of the Fathers, angels succeeded to their places. All the operations of Providence were supposed to be performed by their ministrations, and they became objects of reverence, as the guardian divinities of the heathen had been before them.

† To Origen's general principle, that the souls of men were shut up in bodies as a punishment for sins committed in a preëxistent state, he admits a few exceptions. These are cases of men of distinguished sanctity, who have lived in times past, and whose souls were, in fact, angels, sent on an extraordinary legation, as in the case of John, to testify to the truth, and conduct men to virtue and happiness.

On this subject, subsequent Fathers preferred against him many and grievous complaints. Thus he maintained, it is said, that Christ suffered for the redemption of all rational natures, including the souls of men, angels, demons, sun, moon, and stars. He asserted, says Theophilus of Alexandria,* that Christ was 'fixed to the cross for demons and wicked spirits above'; and Jerome accuses him of saying, that he had 'often suffered, and would suffer in the air, and places above, for the salvation of demons.'† Theophilus complains, that he would save even 'the devil,' and in the language of the prophet,‡ calls on the heavens 'to be astonished, and to be horribly afraid,' at such daring impiety!

But let us consult Origen himself. In his tenth homily on Luke, he says expressly, that the advent of Christ 'profited celestials,' § and, in support of the assertion, refers to Colos. i. 20. In his first homily on Leviticus, he speaks of a 'double sacrifice,' and 'double victim,' of the blood of Christ sprinkled on the earthly, and also on the 'supernal' altar; and he asserts explicitly, that he was 'offered a victim, not only for terrestrial, but also for celestial beings,' || and more to the same purpose. Again, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, he says, 'So great was the efficacy of Christ's cross and death, that it was sufficient not only for the human race, but for celestial powers and orders. For, according to the sentiment of the Apostle Paul, Christ pacified, by the blood of his cross, not only "things in earth," but also "things in heaven,"' ¶ that is, angels, sun, moon, and stars. Again, 'He is the great high priest, who offered himself not only for men, but also for every being partaking of reason;—he died not only for men, but likewise for other rational beings; he tasted death for every creature; for it is absurd to say, that he tasted death for human sins, but not also for whatever other beings, besides man, have committed sin; for example, for the stars, the stars not being pure in his sight, as we read in Job, xxv. 5, "Yea, even the stars are not pure in his sight," unless perchance this is said hyperbol-

* Lib. Pasch. ii.

† Apol. ad Ruf. L. i. & Epist. 94, al. 59, ad Avit.

‡ Jeremiah, ii. 12.

§ Opp. T. iii. p. 943.

|| Opp. T. ii. p. 186.

¶ Opp. T. iv. p. 568. The passage of St. Paul is that above alluded to, Colos. i. 20.

ically.* Such, according to Origen, was the extent of the redemption through Christ.

It may well be doubted whether there is any solid foundation for the other part of the accusation brought against him by Theophilus, Jerome, and others, that he believed that Christ had repeatedly suffered, or would suffer, in the heavens and in the air. This doctrine is not expressly taught in any of his writings now extant, and the contrary seems to be often implied. True, he alludes to an offering in the heavens, but apparently speaks of it as accompanying his sacrifice on earth, and not as an act to be repeated.

With regard to the points afterwards agitated during the famous Pelagian controversy, the authority of Origen, as well as that of all preceding Fathers, could be adduced in opposition to the Augustinian doctrines. These doctrines seem to have been regarded as a novelty at the time; and many of those, who condemned the opinions of Pelagius, were not prepared to adopt, in full extent, the views of his celebrated antagonist. Origen has been called the father of Pelagianism, and certainly the germ and substance of the Pelagian doctrines are found in his writings.

His views of the effects of Adam's sin were censured by the orthodox of subsequent ages, but were apparently in unison with the opinions of the church at the time he wrote. He has the phrase 'sin of nativity,' and speaks of the 'similitude of Adam's transgression, not only derived from birth, but contracted,' but in what sense he understood these, and similar expressions, is matter of doubt; certainly not in the modern. He had no notion of any such consequences attending Adam's transgression, as have been ascribed to it in orthodox systems from the time of Augustine down to the present day. In a moral view, he seems, in fact, hardly to attribute any thing to the fall, and in his general reasoning, does not distinguish between what is called a 'state of fallen nature,' and a state of primitive integrity, at least so far as the sin of our first parents is concerned. All souls, he supposed, sinned in a preëxisting state, and consequently came into the world under certain disadvantages. But they are subjected to these disadvantages, not by the disobedience of Adam, but by the guilt contracted, by our abuse of liberty, in a prior state.

* Comment. in Joan. T. I. Opp. T. IV. pp. 41, 42. See also Comment. in Matt. T. III. pp. 380, 381.

Origen allows to the soul, in its fallen state, the most perfect freedom and moral ability ; the power to choose and pursue virtue, and reject and fly from sin, and this power is retained by demons, and even the devil. Good, as well as evil motives, originate in the heart. To live well, is 'our own work,' the result of our own volitions and efforts ; 'God demands it of us, not as his work, but as our own.' And he goes on to show, from numerous texts of the Old and New Testament, that it is in our power to live as God requires, and that 'we are the cause of our perdition or salvation.' He then proceeds to explain certain passages, which, it seems, were adduced by some heretics of the Oriental, or Gnostic sects, to establish a different doctrine ; and these, it is deserving of notice, are precisely those, which, in modern times, have been brought to prove that our goodness is the work of God, and not of ourselves ; that it is the result of the special agency of his spirit, and not primarily of our own volitions. On all these he puts a construction, which would now be called decidedly Arminian. The passages referred to are, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, *Exod. iv. 21* ; the taking away a heart of stone, and giving a heart of flesh, *Ezek. xi. 19* ; 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy,' *Rom. ix. 16* ; 'He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth,' and the following verses, containing the illustration of the potter and the clay, *Rom. ix. 18-23* ; and some others. All these, he so explains as to leave man entire freedom and ability, moral as well as physical, to do good or evil, and make sin or virtue his own act. He attributes to God not our volition, but only the power of volition. Thus, in explaining the phrase, 'To will, and to do, is of God,' as he quotes, *Phil. ii. 13*, he observes, 'The Apostle does not say, that to will good or evil, and to do better or worse, are of God, but only generally to will, and to perform,' that is, the power to will and to perform. He draws an illustration from the power of motion. That we are capable of motion, he says, is of God, but the particular direction of our motions depends on ourselves ; so 'we receive of God the power to will, but we may use this power for good or for evil, as also the power to perform.' *

* *De Princip. L. III. c. 1. De Arbitrii Libertate.*

Origen speaks in general terms of the necessity of divine grace, to enable us to attain to the perfection of the Christian character, but it was his belief that this grace is granted as the reward of our goodness, that it is in no sense the exciting cause, and that the measure of it is determined by the exercise of our own wills, that is, it is bestowed in proportion to our previous merits, and not by an arbitrary act of God's sovereignty. He seems afraid, almost, of attributing too much to God's agency. Holiness originates in our own wills; we must sow the seeds, but, the plant once introduced, God fosters and cherishes it.

God thus grants the assistance of his spirit, as Origen supposed, in proportion to our merits, and in consideration of them. But in our merits, are included the good actions done in a preëxistent state, as well as those performed in the present; so that God may make a distinction between one and another, bestowing his grace on one, and withholding it from another, loving one, and hating another, before they 'have done good or evil,' that is, in the present life, as in the case of Jacob and Esau. Rom. ix. 11 - 13.*

Origen admits of no unconditional election, but makes predestination depend altogether on our works foreseen.† God is said to make 'one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor'; but the cause, says Origen, is in ourselves. He who purges himself from impurity, is made a vessel of honor; he who suffers himself to remain polluted with sin, is made a vessel to dishonor. 'Each one is made by God a vessel of honor, or of dishonor, according to his merits' in this, or a preëxistent state. 'It is just,' he adds, 'and in every respect agreeable to piety, that each one should be made a vessel of honor, or of dishonor, from *preceding causes*,' and these, he insists, are our merits, our actions. These, foreseen, are the ground, and the only ground, of predestination.‡

We have treated of the opinions of Origen, relating to the past and present character and condition of rational natures, and especially man. We now turn to his representation of the future.

His views of the resurrection have been a subject of con-

* De Princip. L. III. c. 1. Also Lib. I. c. 7.

† Huet. Orig. Lib. II. c. 2. Quæst. 7.

‡ De Princip. L. III. c. 1. Comment. in Rom. Lib. I. VII. Opp. T. IV. pp. 464, 604, 616.

troversy. He was accused by several subsequent Fathers, and by Jerome among the rest, of denying it in reality, and retaining only the name. And if by the resurrection we are to understand the restoration of the flesh of the present body in substance and figure, he undoubtedly did deny it, thinking with St. Paul, that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' He could, in consistency with himself, entertain no other opinion. For, according to his system, the flesh is the prison-house of the soul, which it is doomed to occupy for the punishment of its sins. All spirits become clothed with bodies more or less gross, according to their degree of moral pollution. They remain, however, in a state of discipline, and may be restored. When they shall have purified themselves from their stains, and regained their pristine beauty and excellence, they will drop the incumbrance of their material or fleshy chains, and become once more subtile and ethereal. So Origen undoubtedly thought. The souls of the faithful, at death, will part for ever with their present earthly and corruptible integuments; the body, compacted as it now is, will not be restored; it will rise, but other and different, more pure and splendid. The present is but the germ of the future, according to the illustration of Paul, who says, 'it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.'

With regard to the form of the future body, it has been generally inferred, from the manner in which Origen has expressed himself, and from the analogy of his system, that he regarded it as round. Such is the figure esteemed most perfect; such that of the heavenly bodies, those more glorious intelligences; and such, as he seems to have supposed, will be ours, though he has not, we believe, directly asserted it in any of his writings we now possess. Certain it is, that his followers professed to have derived the doctrine from him, and it was prevalent among the Origenian monks of Palestine, in the time of Justinian.*

Origen believed in the final restoration of all beings to virtue and happiness. All are subjected to influences, which, sooner or later, will prove successful. Superior orders of

* Among the anathemas subjoined to his Letter to Menas, on the subject of the errors of Origen, is the following; 'Whoever says, or thinks, that our bodies will be raised spherical, and not erect, let him be anathema.'

intelligences are appointed to instruct, guide, and perfect the lower. Of the glorious spirits, who have imitated the divine perfections, some, as the reward of their merits, are placed in the 'order of angels, others of virtues, others of principalities, others of powers, because they exercise power over those who require to be in subjection; others of thrones, exercising the office of judging and directing those who have need.' To the care and rule of these noble orders, the race of man is subjected, and, using their assistance, and reformed by their salutary instructions and discipline, will, in some future, though perhaps, distant age, be restored to their primitive state of felicity.*

The sufferings of a future life, as Origen taught, are all piacular and remedial. We shall all, he says, be subjected to trial by fire. But those who have few impurities, and many virtues, will escape with slight pain; but the fire will take hold of the wicked, and their iniquities will be burned, and their evil affections purged away. Some, however, in consequence of inveterate habits of sin, will be reserved to a great intensity and long continuance of suffering.†

So he sometimes expresses himself. But in other parts of his writings, he is careful to teach us, that this, and similar language, is altogether metaphorical. By the fire, which shall burn the wicked, he tells us, is meant the worm of conscience. The evil of their whole lives will, by an act of divine power, be vividly presented to their thoughts. The picture of all the wrong they have done, or intended, will be spread out before their eyes; forgotten things will be remembered, and they will have a horrible consciousness of guilt. This is the flame by which they are to be tormented, not an outward and material, but an inward fire, of which their sins furnish the fuel, just as the peccant humors of the body, consequent upon excess and repletion, furnish the fuel of fever.‡ These humors may be purged away, and the patient restored, after a season of suffering. Just so with regard to the impurities of sin, which occasion so much anguish. By the salutary discipline of suffering, the soul may, and will, be cleansed

* De Princip. L. I. c. 6. Jerome, Epist. 94, ad Avitum.

† Exod. Hom. vi. Opp. T. II. p. 148. In Psal. 36. Hom. III. Opp. T. II. p. 664.

‡ De Princip. Lib. II. c. 10. Jerome, Epist. ad Av. 94.

from them. Such is its design, such its tendency, and such will be its result. All will be chastised exactly in proportion to their demerit, but their sufferings will have an end, and all will be finally restored to purity and to love. This, Origen repeatedly asserts.

The end and consummation of all things, he observes, is the perfection and happiness of all. 'To this one end,' condition, or state, he says, 'we think that the goodness of God, through his Christ, will recall his universal creation, all things becoming finally subjected to Christ. "For all things must be subject to him." * Now, what is this subjection,' he asks, 'with which all things must be subject to Christ? I think, the same with which we also desire to be subject to him, with which the Apostles, and all the saints, who have followed Christ, are subject to him. For the very term subjection, in this case, implies, that they who are subject, have obtained the salvation which is of Christ.' Then it is, that 'Christ himself shall also be subject to the Father, with and in those who have been made subject.' This, he observes, is asserted by the Apostle, when he says, 'And when all things shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son, also, himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' And this subjection of all Christ's enemies to himself, as that of himself to the Father, Origen contends, 'is a good and salutary' subjection; if the latter is such, the former is so too, and hence, 'as, when it is said, the Son is subject to the Father, the perfect restitution of the universal creation is declared, so when the enemies of the Son are said to be subject to him, the salvation, through him, of those subject, and the restitution of the lost, are implied.' †

Again, in his seventh homily on Leviticus, he contends, that subjection to Christ implies subjection of the will and affections, and that as long as any thing remains opposed to him, in other words, as long as there is sin, his work is not consummated. 'But,' he adds, 'when he shall have consummated his work, and brought his universal creation to the summit of perfection, then he himself shall be subject in those, whom he has subdued to the Father, and in whom he has consummated the work which the Father gave him to do, that God may be all in all.' ‡

* 1 Cor. xv. 24 — 28.

† De Princip. L. i. c. 6. Lib. iii. c. 5.

‡ Opp. T. ii. p. 222.

Such, according to Origen, will be the end, or final consummation of all things. His train of reasoning throughout, as it will be perceived, implies his belief of the final restoration and happiness, not merely of the human race, but of all rational natures, including demons, and fallen spirits of darkness, otherwise the universal creation could not be said to be subjected and made perfect. When, in connexion with the train of reasoning above exhibited, we take the fact before stated, that he supposed Christ died for the heavenly hosts, and for demons, for all rational beings who had sinned, we cannot doubt that such was his belief. Such it was understood to have been, in the time of Theophilus above referred to, and of Jerome, both of whom make it one of the capital articles in the catalogue of his heresies, that he taught that 'the devil' would be finally saved. In fact, there are passages in his writings, which appear expressly to inculcate this doctrine. Thus, he observes, 'The last enemy, which is called death, is spoken of as destroyed.' By death, it seems, he understood the devil, or 'him that had the power of death,' Heb. ii. 14; and he proceeds to explain what is meant by his destruction. 'The last enemy,' he says, 'is not to be understood as so destroyed, that his substance, which was derived from God, shall perish; but only that his malignant will and purpose, which proceeded not from God, but from himself, shall cease to exist. He shall be destroyed, therefore, not so that he shall not continue to be, but so that he shall not continue to be an enemy, and death.'* Nothing more needs be said, to show that a belief of the final restoration of all fallen beings formed part of the creed of Origen.† The more deeply fallen, however, will be subjected, as he taught, to protracted and severe sufferings, and God alone knows their termination. But all will mount, step by step, till they attain 'to the invisible and eternal state, some in the first, some in the second, and some in the last ages; corrected and reformed, by rigorous discipline and very great and grievous punishments, by the instructions of angels, and afterwards by superior orders of intelligences.'

The rewards of the blessed, Origen makes to consist in an intimate union, or oneness, with God, according to the prayer

* *De Princip. L. III. c. 6.* See also *Lib. I. c. 6.*

† See on this point the Letter of Jerome already repeatedly referred to.

of Christ, John xvii, 21 – 24. They do not, however, rise to the summit of this felicity at once, but through several successive steps, as first by knowledge and instruction, which remove the darkness of their understandings, then by being brought into a moral resemblance to God, then by being taken into union with him, in which consists the supreme good. This union is explained as a union of affection, will, and purpose. The soul, on leaving the body, is first conducted, as he tells us, to a part of the earth called Paradise,* where it remains for some time, enjoying the instruction of angels, and gradually depositing its earthly concretions. It then mounts into the air, and afterwards into various regions of the heavens, continuing in these several places, under different masters of the superior orders of intelligences, for a longer or shorter term, according to the degree of impurity to be purged off, till, by various progressions, it reaches the invisible and incorporeal heavens, where God resides, where, as we have said, it becomes united with him, as in its first state of felicity and love, and he becomes ‘all in all,’ dwelling in all, and all in him. Matter will then become spiritualized, and be reabsorbed in God, from whom it flowed. Thus all ends where all began;

‘From thee, great God, we spring, to thee we tend.’

Such was Origen’s great system, yet he occasionally expresses views which appear in some respects to militate against it. Thus he seems to say that there will be perpetual lapses and returns, from sin to holiness, and from superior orders of beings to inferior, and the reverse, in consequence

* It is curious to observe, that Origen, while he places Eden or the terrestrial Paradise, in the third heavens, imagining that by Adam and Eve dwelling in it, we are to understand souls residing in heaven, and by their expulsion, the exile of souls, doomed, as the punishment of sin, to be clothed with bodies, he supposes the future, or celestial Paradise, to be situated somewhere on the earth. ‘I think,’ says he, ‘that saints departing this life, will remain in a certain part of the earth called in the Scriptures Paradise, as in a school of instruction.’ The same, he supposed, was intended by ‘Abraham’s bosom.’ Here, all which they have witnessed on earth, is to be explained to them, and they are to receive revelations of the future not now permitted. This place, the more pure will soon leave, and mount through various mansions, called by the Greeks, spheres, but in the Scriptures, heavens. *De Princip. L. II. c. 11. § 6.*

of that moral liberty, which all will retain, and which they may for ever use or abuse. Thus Peter may, at some future time, become a Judas, and Judas a Peter; Paul a Caiaphas, and Caiaphas, Paul; men may become angels or demons, and angels or demons, men; demons and angels may change characters; the devil may become an archangel, and archangels devils, all things mingling and revolving in unceasing succession. Upon this hypothesis, there can be no fixed condition, either of happiness or suffering; neither the punishment of the damned, nor the joys of the blessed, are necessarily eternal; all beings are in a state of perpetual progression and retrogression. The material universe will undergo corresponding changes. There was a succession of worlds before the present, and will be a succession after it, the new springing from the old, as the bird of fable from the ashes of its sire. Souls will fall into sin, and, for their punishment, must be again imprisoned in gross bodies; and this will always create a necessity for the existence of matter, which will be absorbed and produced, reabsorbed and reproduced, in successive and never-ending periods.* It may well be doubted, however, whether such was Origen's fixed opinion. On many points, he is uncertain and vacillating. But with regard to the final restoration of all beings to a union with the fountain of Divinity, when Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and God shall be all in all, he is clear and express. He often recurs to the topic, and his views on the subject are fully unfolded. We may be pardoned, if we hesitate to admit, upon the evidence of a few slight expressions, his belief of a doctrine, which, in opposition to the general tenor of his reasonings, teaches that sin shall never be abolished, and the time will never come, when 'all things shall be subdued to the Son,' and all shall be 'of one heart, and of one mind.' It would be no easy task, however, to defend Origen against the charge of inconsistency and self-contradiction. It was his fate to lose himself in the mazes of a wild and wandering philosophy. How deeply he had drunken into its spirit, the foregoing summary of his *Opinions*, abundantly shows. We mean not to be his apologist. Our aim has been, to be, simply, the historian of his opinions, not to combat or defend them.

* *De Princip. L. i. c. 6.* Jerome, ad Avitum.

We have now done with our enumeration. Is it asked, to what does all this labor tend? These are but the opinions of an individual; in what way do they concern us? We can only say, in reply, they form a chapter in the history of the human mind. They illustrate the modes of thinking and reasoning in former times. Above all, they make us acquainted with the source and progress of those corruptions of the Christian doctrine, the effects of which we still witness and deplore. They show us that the great principle of the divine unity, the foundation stone of both the Jewish and Christian dispensations, was, however, as yet, held sacred, though errors were creeping in, which were destined soon to overshadow it. They show us, that doctrines, now esteemed by many the chief glory of Christianity, doctrines illustrated and defended by the acuteness and eloquence of our Calvins and Edwardses, our Princeton and our Andover Theologians, doctrines, without the belief of which, we are gravely told that we have no title to the name of Christ's followers, were unknown to Christian antiquity; that the sects, which came nearest embracing these doctrines, were certain heretics of the Gnostic school. We thus derive from them, both admonition and solace; we derive, also, lessons of forbearance and charity, and we learn to pity the spirit of exclusion, denunciation, and bitterness, which has been justly pronounced 'one of the gross immoralities of our times.'

It is humiliating to reflect, that however the improved philosophy of the age has led us to reject many of the strange opinions of the Fathers, yet in freedom of discussion, independence of thought, and latitude of sentiment and expression, they were greatly in advance of modern times. There was less of narrowness and bigotry then, vastly less, than now. We smile at their errors, and their violent contentions about things, as we think, of little moment; but we should do well to take example of their piety, and often, indeed, of their charity. Judged by the standard set up by the exclusionists of the present day, nearly all the Christian writers, for three centuries after the birth of the Saviour, must descend to take their place in the rank of infidels. So has Christian charity become narrowed.

The fate of the Origenian doctrines, after the brilliant, but erratic spirit, which had contributed to give them currency, had been withdrawn from the earth, is exceedingly interest-

ing. The storm raised against him, during his life, as has been already shown,* had no reference whatever to doctrine; nor have we any evidence that his orthodoxy was formally impugned, until long after his death. † The first writer, who ventured to censure the doctrines of Origen, after his decease, as we are informed by Socrates, the historian, ‡ was Methodius, bishop of Olympus in Lycia, afterwards of Tyre, who died early in the fourth century, fifty years after Origen left the world. He wrote a book on the Resurrection, against Origen, and another, says Jerome, § on 'the Pythoness,' 1 Sam. xxviii. The attack on Origen, however, seems to have been deemed a rash one. Origen's writings were now held in unbounded admiration, and Methodius found it convenient to recant.

Origen's reputation for orthodoxy continued unsullied, till the celebrated Arian controversy broke out, when he was claimed by both parties, though his opinions coincided with neither. The Arians could, of right, claim him, as asserting that the Son was inferior to the Father, and born in time, but not as affirming that he was made out of nothing, which was their distinguishing dogma. The Athanasians could claim him, as asserting, with the Ante-Nicene Fathers generally,

* See *The Christian Examiner* for July, 1831, p. 315.

† We are aware that Eusebius, *Lib. vi. c. 36*, alludes to a letter written by Origen to Fabian, Bishop of Rome, 'concerning his own orthodoxy,' which would seem to imply that it was by some drawn into suspicion; but on what points, we are not told. The matter appears to have produced no excitement. If so, it was soon allayed. Among the charges brought against him by his enemies at Alexandria, in consequence of which he was deposed and banished, not one related to doctrine; which is sufficient evidence that he was not regarded as deviating, in any essential particular, from the popular faith.

Again, in the fragment of a letter to some Alexandrian friends, still extant, he speaks of those who ascribed to him blasphemous doctrine; but this was said, as it appears from the letter, in reference to some books, which had been wholly, or in part, forged in his name, and circulated by heretics. It was these books which contained the blasphemous doctrine. To one charge, however, he distinctly alludes, and to one only, and that relates to the salvation of the devil. See *Opp. T. i. pp. 5, 6.*

‡ *Lib. vi. c. 13.*

§ *Col. Script. Eccles.* Jerome also mentions a treatise of Methodius on 'Free Will.' This, it seems, was written in the form of a dialogue between a Valentinian and a Catholic, and was designed to prove, that evil arises from abuse of liberty in free agents, which was also the doctrine of Origen.

that he had an existence from eternity, not *with*, but *in*, the Father, not as a real being, or person, but an attribute. On the whole, the orthodox had, at this time, receded further from the views of Origen, if not in letter, at least in spirit, than the Arians. The former, however, regarded him as too important an ally to be surrendered. They continued to defend him as long as with decency they could, and even Athanasius quotes him with approbation. From this time, however, Origen had a strong party against him, though his friends and admirers were yet numerous, and many of them among the most learned and accomplished writers of the age. Eusebius and Pamphilus, with a tender regard for his memory, composed an Apology for him, in six books, and his writings were collected and deposited in the Library at Cæsarea.*

It appears, then, that the soundness of Origen's opinions on the subject of the Trinity, first began to be called in question after the rise of Arianism. But the defection from him was by no means general, even then. The majority, even, of the orthodox, were still friendly to his memory. Socrates, it is curious to observe, after mentioning some authors, who had written against him down to the close of the fourth century, says, that though they collected whatever they supposed blameworthy in Origen, some mentioning one thing, and some another, yet they found no fault with him on the subject of the Trinity.† This assertion, we suppose, must be taken with some qualification. From the days of Arius,

* In this Apology, nine charges are mentioned as brought against him by his enemies. Some of these, however, are evidently unfounded, and a part inconsistent with the rest. Thus he was accused of saying, that 'the Son of God was not begotten'; of retailing the fabulous opinions of Valentinus, concerning his birth; of maintaining, with Artemon and Paul of Samosata, that he was a mere man; of saying that the account of him, given by the Evangelists, is a mere allegory, and not a history of events that actually occurred; of asserting that there were two Christs; of allegorizing, generally, the lives of the saints recorded in the Scriptures; of holding some unsound opinions concerning the resurrection of the dead, and of denying that sinners will be punished; of entertaining erroneous views of the state of the soul; and, lastly, of maintaining that human souls will hereafter pass into the bodies of beasts, fishes, and serpents. It requires but a very superficial acquaintance with the writings of Origen, to convince any person that these charges are, with one or two exceptions, wholly unfounded.

† L. VI. c. 13.

however, down to the time of Theophilus the Alexandrian, and Epiphanius, near the close of the fourth century, the adherents and friends of Origen formed a very large proportion of Christians. Another tempest then arose, more violent than the former. The monks of Egypt and Palestine were at this time decided Origenists. Theophilus having embroiled himself in a dispute with some of the former, who inhabited the monasteries of Nitria, assembled a Provincial Synod at Alexandria, about the year 400, in which to gratify, as it would seem, a passion of revenge, or hatred, he caused the writings of their favorite, Origen, to be condemned a century and a half after his death. This is the first time sentence of condemnation was pronounced against the errors of Origen by a Synod. Theophilus, who had a talent for intrigue, immediately wrote to the bishops generally, and to Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, in particular, urging him to the same step. The latter, duped by the arts of the wily Egyptian, called a council of the Cyprian bishops, who proceeded to pass sentence of condemnation, both on Origen and his writings. This controversy, which was long and fierce, involved John, bishop of Jerusalem, and John Chrysostom, of Constantinople, both favorers of Origen, also Rufinus and Jerome, who were soon engaged in terrific battle. In fact, the whole East and West were now shaken with tremendous commotions.* Theophilus boasts, that he had 'truncated the serpents of Origen with the evangelic sword.' Epiphanius adds, 'Amalek is destroyed,' and boasts that he will sweep the heresy of Origen from the face of the earth. Jerome swells the note of triumph. 'Where now,' he asks, 'is the crooked serpent, where the venomous vipers?'

We may give, as a specimen of the hate engendered by this controversy, the parting words which passed between John Chrysostom of Constantinople, and Epiphanius, when the latter, after a violent altercation, was about to leave Constantinople for Cyprus. 'May you not die a bishop,' says Epiphanius to John. 'May you never live to reach home,' retorts the golden-mouthed John. The wishes of both were

* See Jerome, Epist. 38, al 61. ad Pammach. Also Epist. 39, al 62. ad Theoph., with other Letters of Jerome to Theophilus, and of Theophilus and Epiphanius to Jerome. Jerome, Opp. T. iv. Ed. Par. 1706. Socrates. L. vi. c. 10. Huet. Orig. L. ii. c. 4.

granted. Chrysostom was soon after deposed, and died in exile, A. D. 407, and Epiphanius, having embarked for Cyprus, died on the passage, A. D. 403. Theophilus, who had rendered himself odious by the indulgence of his violent and revengeful passions, died A. D. 412. On his death-bed, as tradition says, he expressed great remorse, and the ghost of the injured Chrysostom, whose downfall had been procured chiefly by his machinations, standing at his pillow, shook his soul with terror.

Though Origenism had now received some heavy blows, it yet gave symptoms of life. The publication of a translation of Origen's books 'Of Principles,' at Rome, by Rufinus, had been the occasion of awakening the spirit of Pelagius, whose doctrines were, in fact, only a certain modification of Origenism. Anastasius, however, the first Pope of the name, had condemned Rufinus for heresy, and passed sentence against Origen and his writings; and the friends of his name and doctrines had certainly some reason to indulge desponding anticipations.

This explosion past, a long period of comparative quiet followed. Meantime, Origenism found shelter in the monasteries of Palestine, where, a little more than a century after, it continued to prevail to an alarming extent. Complaints were made to the Emperor Justinian, who caused sentence of anathema to be pronounced against Origen by several bishops, among whom were Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople, Ephrem of Antioch, Peter, bishop of Jerusalem, and Vigilius of Rome, about the year 538. This sentence was confirmed by the fifth General Council, holden at Constantinople, A. D. 553; * and again by the sixth, holden also at Constantinople, A. D. 680. The acts of this Council were confirmed by Pope Leo II. A. D. 683, and thus Origen was formally placed in the rank of heretics. His works are still, however, permitted to be perused by Catholics, with a *Caute lege*, in the margin, against the offensive passages, to put the reader on his guard.

The grand principle of human liberty, for which he was so strenuous an advocate, has never been banished from the minds of Christians. The opposers of Augustine, in former

* See Evagrius, Eccles. Hist. L. iv. c. 38, and Valesius' note. Huet. Orig. L. ii. c. 4, § 3.

days, and of Calvin, in modern times, have necessarily occupied the ground of Origen, and the Fathers of his age. Augustine himself took this ground, in his attempt to refute the tenets of the Manichæans, though, in opposing the doctrines of Pelagius, he was compelled to change it. In fact, the views of human ability, or rather inability, as taught in the schools of the African bishop, of Calvin, and the Orthodox generally of modern times, amount, in substance, to Manichæism, and differ from it only as to the source of the inability; the Manichæans attributing it to a prior necessity, growing out of the nature of matter, and the Calvinists to a necessity superinduced by the fall of Adam. To all practical purposes, the two systems are the same.*

ART. III. — *Causes and Evils of Contentions unveiled in Letters to Christians.* By NOAH WORCESTER. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1831. 12mo. pp. 120.

THERE is no man living, from whom Christians, of all denominations, should receive rebuke with so much meekness, as from the venerable author of these Letters, the Apostle of Peace. He is, himself, an illustration of the possibility of uniting freedom of inquiry, and great distinctness and earnestness in the exposure of what he conceives to be prevalent errors, with a candor and simplicity so beautiful and touching, that those who read his writings, if they are not convinced, can hardly fail of being softened and conciliated. It is not his object, in the little volume before us, to condemn or discourage controversy, but merely to unveil the causes

* Augustine, it should be remembered, was a Manichæan before his conversion to the orthodox faith. How far he retained the *spirit* of Manichæism, after his formal rejection of its leading dogma relating to the origin of evil, — in other words, to what extent his sentiments, after his conversion, continued to be modified by his earlier belief, and what portion of Manichæism became, therefore, infused into the popular theology, forms a curious question in the history of human opinions. Is Calvinism, after all, only a ramification of the old Oriental heresy, so detested by the Fathers?

and evils of that exclusive and contentious spirit, with which controversy is sometimes conducted. He does not write as a sectarian, nor evince a wish, in any part of his work, to cast the blame of our contentions on Christians of one denomination, rather than on those of another. His last words are these ;

‘Let it then be observed, that I have written the letters in the belief that there are errors — both of opinion and practice, in all the denominations of Christians with which I am acquainted ; and in the hope that there are good people in each sect, who will deplore the existing evils, and exert their influence to effect a reformation.’ — p. 120.

He says, also, in another place ;

‘To some persons, it may be gratifying to know, that the views I have expressed, in this series of letters, on the evil and danger of ascribing error of opinion to wickedness of heart, are not the effect of recent changes in my own mind. When I was a Trinitarian, and nearly forty years ago, I published similar views of that principle in what I then wrote to the late Dr. Baldwin, on the subject of “Close Communion.” Very soon after I entered on the work of the ministry, I became dissatisfied with the practice of referring all error of opinion, on religious subjects, to a criminal source ; and also with the practice of reproaching whole sects of Christians as destitute of piety, on the ground of their alleged erroneous opinions. The more I have reflected on the subject since that period, the more I have been convinced of the injustice and the danger of such practices. The more, too, I have been convinced that such practices imply a deplorable want of humility in those who adopt them, and an astonishing degree of blindness in regard to their own liability to err.’ — p. 116.

Dr. Worcester holds that a primary ground of alienation, among Christians, is to be found in the assumption, ‘that error of opinion, on religious subjects, proceeds from wickedness of heart.’ We suspect, however, that even where this is the ostensible ground of alienation, we are still, in most cases, to look deeper for the real grounds. These, nine times out of ten, are some, or all, of the following ; pride of opinion, desire of influence, love of notoriety, party policy or zeal, private interest or pique. Unhappily, not a few of the leaders of the exclusive sects know, that they owe most of their consequence and influence to existing differences and contentions, and would sink personally into comparative in-

significance, in the event of a better understanding among Christians. So long as this is the case, we may expect that persons of considerable ability, as disorganizers, will every where be found, whose object it will be, under various pretexts, to foment and perpetuate divisions in the Church, rather than to heal them. Here we detect a real, deep-seated, and, as it seems to us, in a community like ours, almost the only obstacle to the prevalence of more liberal and comprehensive principles. It did not fall within Dr. Worcester's plan, and would not, perhaps, have suited his temper, to deal severely with this vice; but he has deprived it of all show of justification or apology, by exposing the fallacy of the assumption on which it proceeds.

In the Fourth Letter, the following important question is met, and answered.

'It being granted that our Lord imputed the error of the unbelieving Jews respecting himself, to a disobedient heart, why may not ministers of the Gospel of the present age, impute all supposed errors on important doctrines to the same source?' — pp. 22, 23.

Because, as Dr. Worcester justly argues, it would be to suppose them clothed with the same infallibility, of but one opinion, and liable to no disturbing prejudices.

'Besides,' says he, 'in civil cases, an *interested* person is deemed unqualified to act as a judge or a juror. So also is the man who is known to be prejudiced against a person or party whose cause is to be decided. How imminent, then, must be the danger, when, after long controversy and excitement, a minister of one sect ventures to assume the office of a judge in respect to the hearts of those who dissent from his creed! Under such circumstances, what reflecting man would dare, unauthorized, to assume such responsibility? How little confidence is to be placed in the censorious opinions mutually expressed of each other by political partizans, in a time of great excitement? Quite as little, I suspect, is to be placed in the opinions of religious partizans under similar circumstances.' — p. 24.

At the same time, he finds no difficulty in accounting for the different opinions which have prevailed in the Church, without referring them, universally or generally, to a corrupt source. The following extract alone would settle the question.

'When children are brought up under the influence of pious parents, who happen to entertain erroneous doctrines, they are

under a kind of necessity of imbibing erroneous opinions. For a child to be thus situated may be a calamity, but not a crime; and it is rather an evidence of an obedient than a disobedient heart, that he imbibes the erroneous opinions of his parents. For he is required to honor father and mother, and a disposition to obey this command, will naturally incline him to listen to parental instruction, and to receive as truth what his parents inculcate as the doctrines of the Gospel. It is as unreasonable as it is cruel, for a Protestant to impute it to wickedness of heart, that the children of Papists grow up strongly attached to the doctrines of the Catholic church. We may as rationally blame a child for not having been born omniscient, or for possessing the spirit of filial love and reverence, as to blame him for receiving, as truth, the erroneous opinions which were inculcated on him by his parents, while it was impossible for him to know that they were incorrect. Let any censorious minister ask himself, what would be his views of others, who should impute it to wickedness of heart, that his children hearken to his instructions, and grow up in the belief of his religious opinions? To whatever denomination a child may belong, the more pious and humble he is, the more likely he is to imbibe the religious opinions of his parents, whether they be correct or erroneous.' — pp. 27, 28.

Again he says;

'The disputes which have divided Christians into sects, have originated in differences of opinion about the meaning of particular passages of Scripture, which were acknowledged to be genuine by each party, — and to be true in the sense intended by the inspired writers. To express the supposed sense of the passages more definitely, has been an object of those who have formed creeds or confessions of faith. Propositions which men have thus formed, have been set up as standards of faith, and as tests of Christian character; and to these, others must give their assent, or be denied Christian privileges. These propositions, of human manufacture, are what their advocates denominate *the truth as it is in Jesus*. Those who refuse their assent to these dogmas, are reproached as enemies to the truth, while they freely admit, as the truth, the very texts of Scripture, on which these articles are supposed to be founded. It seems to have been thought not sufficient for a man to believe the doctrines of the Gospel, as given by the wisdom of God, but he must assent to an edition of these doctrines as *revised* and *amended*, by the wisdom of self-sufficient men. The "bones of contention" have not been the words of God's wisdom, but the words of man's wisdom; and these words of man's wisdom have

been preferred to the words of God, as standards of truth and tests of character. I think I do not go too far, in saying that these human compositions have been *preferred* to the Bible, for the purposes I have mentioned. If they are not PREFERRED, why are they urged, and substituted, as if the Bible were insufficient? I am aware, that those who adopt this course, profess great respect for the Bible, and are not commonly backward to accuse dissenters from their creed of disrespect for the oracles of God. But it seems to me an extraordinary mode of evincing a regard for the Bible, to substitute for it, as a rule of faith, the compositions of fallible and uninspired men.' — pp. 28, 29.

The error here condemned, he illustrates in the next Letter, by two examples, the first drawn from the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the other, from that of vicarious atonement. Both of these doctrines have been accounted essential to Christianity, and a belief in both has been made a test of character, and a condition of salvation. Of those, however, who reject these doctrines, the latter as well as the former, we may suppose that many, as Dr. Worcester shows, have not been influenced by a hatred of the truth, nor by disrespect for Scripture, nor by a denial of the particular texts, in which these doctrines are thought by some to be inculcated or implied; but solely by a different construction honestly put on these texts. He adds, in confirmation of this position;

'Now let it be observed, that in both examples, the words relied on are ambiguous; for there is more than one sense in which they are capable of being understood. As a *portrait*, or *image*, is called by the name of the person represented, so the bread and wine may be called the body and blood of Christ, which are represented by them; and it is well known, that there are several senses in which one person may die for another, or for many others.

'Let it also be observed, that in the first example, Christ did *not* say, This bread is *changed* into my body — nor, This wine is *changed* into my blood. Not a syllable was said by him about any change, or transubstantiation. This idea was *added* to the words of Christ by the framers of the doctrine. So in the second example, Christ did *not* say, I lay down my life as a *vicarious punishment* for my sheep. Nor did his Apostles in any instance say, that Christ endured for us "the wrath of God," or the penalty of the divine law due to our offences. This idea was *added* by the framers of the doctrine of vicarious punish-

ment, just as the idea of *change* was added by the framers of the doctrine of transubstantiation. I have no doubt, that in each case, the framers thought the idea they added, to be implied in the words of Scripture; but this is no proof that it was implied, nor that any man had a right to insert it, as the word of God. It is, however, by thus adding to the words of Scripture what men have supposed to be implied, that numerous propositions have been formed as essential articles of faith. Nor has the mischief of this creed-making policy stopped here. Each sect, after having thus formed its essential articles, have called them *the truth*. Hence, with them, to love the truth, is to love the articles of their creed, formed in the words of man's wisdom; and any one who dissents from these articles, is supposed to be a despiser of the truth, an opposer of the truth, an enemy to the God of truth. Of course, the opposition to these supposed truths, is imputed to depravity of heart. Hence persecution, in various forms, has been practised by one sect of Christians against another. What an awful responsibility does a fallible, uninspired man, take on himself, when he ventures to substitute his own opinion of an ambiguous passage of Scripture for the word of God, and to make that opinion a test by which he may judge the hearts of others! — pp. 35, 36, 37.

In the Eighth Letter, he returns to one of the same illustrations, in discussing the propriety of applying the language of Paul respecting the 'natural man,' to those who differ from us in opinion on religious subjects. His words are remarkable, not only as indicating a serious error, but the character of the men most likely to commit it.

'Two persons are disputing on the words of Christ, "I lay down my life for the sheep." One supposes the words to mean, that he would suffer a vicarious punishment for mankind. The other believes that he died for us, but not in that sense of the words, yet in a sense which he thinks far more to the honor of God. These men happen to be of different characters, as well as of different opinions. One of them is meek and humble; the other self-sufficient — he trusts in himself that he is righteous, and despises others. Now which of these men will be the more likely to account for the difference of opinion, by insinuating that the other is a natural man? In this case, no candid and intelligent person can hesitate for a moment. On which side soever the self-sufficient person may be, as to the meaning of the text, he will be the one to reproach his brother as a "natural man." Candor, however, requires me to admit, that there may have been instances in which good men, in other respects, have

been so bewildered by custom, theory, or party feelings, as to adopt such an unchristian mode of proceeding. But I believe it to be a truth, that such a course is much more frequently resorted to by self-righteous hypocrites, than by men of truly Christian feelings; and that it behooves those who are in the habit of thus accounting for a dissent from their opinions, seriously to inquire how their conduct can be reconciled with gospel love and humility, and whether they are not, in fact, in that deplorable state, which they are so forward to impute to others.' — pp. 54, 55.

Two other striking passages occur in the same Letter, which may be said to put at rest the question he is considering.

'Besides, if the natural man has no perception of the truth, how can he be said to *hate* the truth? Can he hate that which he does not perceive? Should it be said, that it is not the *true* meaning of Scripture that he hates, but a *false* meaning which he gives to the words; what is this but saying, in other words, that it is falsehood, and not truth, that the sinner hates?' — p. 56.

Again;

'In both the Old Testament and the New, the conversion of sinners is represented as the effect of divine truth on their minds. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul. The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." Psalm xix. 7. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." 1 Pet. i. 23. Now if the unconverted, as such, are incapable of perceiving the true meaning of Scripture language, and consequently misunderstand it; then it must be by a false meaning of the word that they are converted. Of course, their conversion must be the effect of *falsehood*, and not of *truth*. For they are in an unconverted state till the change occurs; and it is by such views of the word as they have in an unconverted state that they are regenerated, or that the work of regeneration is commenced.' — pp. 59, 60.

Custom, false standards in morals, mistaken notions of duty, and the frequency with which we see the sin, complained of by Dr. Worcester, committed by men of reputed sanctity, have led most persons to form much too low an estimate of its turpitude. He observes, very justly, that,

'It would be in vain to search the Scriptures for more clear prohibitions and expostulations against *murder*, than we have

against *reviling* and *ensorious judging*, on account of differences of opinion; and is it not a lamentable truth, that in each of the cases, Christians have too commonly regarded custom as of higher authority than the prohibitions of God? The sixth commandment is, "Thou shalt do no murder"; but as soon as the rulers of two nations have declared war against each other, murder is regarded as not only lawful, but laudable. So, as soon as the ministers of one sect of Christians have ventured to denounce the people of another sect as heretics, the commands, "Judge not," "Condemn not," "Speak not evil one of another," are treated with as little regard as the sixth commandment is in time of war. As, in time of national hostilities, killing men is deemed a duty, and not a crime, so it is with censorious judging in time of sectarian hostilities; and, in both cases, the most glaring violations of the divine commands are vindicated, on the principles of necessity and self-preservation.' — pp. 75, 76.

In a characteristic Letter, the Sixteenth, Dr. Worcester compares the vice of party-spirit, in religion, with that of intemperance in the use of ardent spirits, and concludes by recommending, in both cases, the 'total-abstinence principle,' as the only effectual remedy.

'The inquiry naturally occurs, Is there no remedy for party intemperance? Must the Christian religion be for ever thus disgraced by its professed admirers and votaries. For a time, it seemed a hopeless enterprise to attempt a suppression of the other species of intemperance. Soon, however, a hope was excited, that by due exertions many moderate drinkers might be induced to give up their habit before they should pass the bounds of temperance; and that many might be saved from forming the habit of moderate drinking. It was hardly expected that men might be reclaimed who had advanced far in the road of intoxication. Their case was deemed nearly hopeless. It was, however, found, that the moderate use of ardent spirits, at stated periods, exposed men to become drunkards; that, by daily indulgence, a thirst was excited which endangered both body and soul, — and that entire abstinence from the use of ardent spirits was the path of safety. Many thousands have become convinced of this, and have adopted the policy, — among whom are an unexpected number of those who were supposed to be past recovery, and bound over by intemperate habits to perish as drunkards. What happy results of a few years' exertion!

'When all the evils of party intemperance shall have been disclosed, they may be found not less terrific and portentous than the evils of intemperate drinking. Why then shall not

Christians of all denominations unite and adopt the same saving policy for both species of intemperance — and resolve on total abstinence from party-spirit as well as from liquid fire? — pp. 102, 103.

It is beyond a question, that comparatively but a small number of persons, and they mostly from other States, are alone responsible for the existence, among us, of what Dr. Codman calls 'polemic war.' The great body of the people would take no part, and feel no interest in these struggles, if they were not set on by their religious guides. It would be sure, in a little time, to restore amity and a good understanding, if ministers and periodical journals, on all sides, would give heed to the judicious counsels offered in these Letters. Speaking of the former, Dr. Worcester says;

'In a time of great excitement and party strife, a minister sits down to write a sermon in vindication of some disputed doctrine, which he believes to be of great importance. But having failed to call humility to his aid, he writes under the influence of party passions. As he proceeds, he grows warmer and warmer, with feelings of contempt or resentment towards all who have opposed his doctrine. He is not contented with producing arguments in its favor; he must give vent to his passions against dissenters. He boldly accuses them of gross errors in their interpretations of the Scriptures; and imputes these errors to the wickedness of their hearts; and fails not to reproach them either as *heretics* or as *bigots*. Thus, while he wantonly calumniates others as destitute of the gospel temper, he evinces a deplorable defect in his own heart. But prior to the time for delivering his discourse, some affecting event of Providence occurs that calls him to deep reflection, occasions a favorable change of feeling, gives humility leave to rise and speak for herself. Hence occurs the following soliloquy: —

"What have I written for a sermon to be delivered by myself, as the ambassador of Him who was 'meek and lowly of heart'? He exercised forbearance towards his erring Apostles, during the whole course of his ministry, though he knew them to be in gross errors of opinion; yet I have reproached hundreds of his professed disciples as his enemies; and have said much to excite against them the contempt of others. But why all this rashness? They indeed differ from me in their interpretations of some passages of Scripture; but if this be a good reason for me to be offended with them, why may not they as justly be offended with me? Are not some of them at least possessed of

as good talents as myself? May they not have had as good advantages for acquiring knowledge? and how do I know that they have been less honest and impartial in their inquiries than I have been in mine? How has it happened that I have been so forward to *accuse* them, and yet so backward in regard to *suspecting* myself? Could this be the work of humility or benevolence? Have I done to others as I would that they should do to me? Even taking it for granted that they are bad men, is my sermon adapted to do them or any body else any good? Will it not give far more proof of wrong in me than of wrong in them? I indeed have *accused them*; but I have done it with a temper which is the reverse of what is required in the gospel of every disciple of Christ. I will therefore revise the sermon, and erase every word which shall appear to me inconsistent with that love which worketh no evil to its neighbour.” — pp. 110 — 112.

Our limits will permit us to give but one more extract, which is in the same strain.

‘In *extempore* speaking, men have not always sufficient time for premeditation, and in the heat of their zeal, they are very liable to utter things which will not bear an impartial review, and which are unjustly reproachful to others. But in writing for the pulpit or the press, I think it would be a good rule, after having written, seriously to examine the copy and inquire, whether nothing has been penned which is contrary to the New Commandment, or the Golden Rule, — nothing which evinces the disposition to take the highest place, or that must excite the idea that the writer is one of those who “trust in themselves that they are righteous, and despise others.” In such a review of what has been written, it might be useful for the writer to inquire, how the language and tone he has used would be likely to appear to him, if adopted by a person of another denomination against himself; and then erase whatever he would deem anti-christian and unkind, if used by another in an exchange of circumstances. Should the parable of our Lord be duly regarded in future, in conducting religious Newspapers and other Periodicals, the effects may be happy in relation to the progress of religion, and the peace of the Christian world.’ — p. 90.

An interesting question arises here, respecting what may be called the rights of self-defence in controversy. Coarse language, misrepresentation, and malice, are alike inexcusable in the assailants, and in the assailed; but perhaps it is a little too much to expect from the latter, if their religious rights

are wrested from them, if their sincerity and piety are called in question, if they are stigmatized as enemies to the truth and enemies to God, and held up as such to public scorn and indignation, that they should bear it without some feeling of resentment, and some expression of this feeling. In all such cases, it is obvious that those who causelessly and wantonly give the provocation, are responsible not only for the bad spirit which they manifest themselves, but also, in a degree, for the bad spirit which they awaken in others. Besides, when the controversy becomes one, not of speculative opinions merely, but of personal rights, the aggrieved party must look on the aggressor, not merely as in error, but as guilty of injustice and crime. Now even supposing that we can, and that we ought, to set aside altogether personal considerations, is it expected that we shall meet and repel what we believe to be injustice and crime, with the same feelings with which we should endeavour to reconcile an honest difference of opinion? At the same time, we believe that there is no party, as such, which is entirely without blame in this matter; and none which may not find much in these Letters 'profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.'

ART. IV.—*A Comparative View of the Social Life of England and France, from the Restoration of Charles the Second to the French Revolution.* By the Editor of Madame du Deffand's Letters. London, 1828. 8vo.

THE work before us is a lively picture of the state of society in England and France during certain periods of their history, exhibited chiefly in the contrasts they present to each other. We have thought it might not be wholly without advantage to call the attention of our readers to the same subject in relation to our own country, and especially to our own Commonwealth. We do this with no desire to institute an invidious comparison with any other community, at home or abroad, but because the state of social life, or the spirit of society, as it is sometimes called, is every where, but espe-

cially among a free people, one of the most powerful agents in forming the character and affecting the happiness of every individual. It is an important, because a practical subject, less imposing perhaps, less calculated for striking effect, but of more personal consequence than the mightier matters, which form the materials of national history, and become, by something of an artificial consequence, subjects of regular study and delight.

By social life we mean the ordinary intercourse of private individuals ; the state, condition, habits, and manners by which that intercourse is regulated ; the prevailing tone of thought, feeling, and affection ; that atmosphere of opinion, as palpable as the one we breathe, operating on the moral health and personal comfort of a community, as air does on the functions of animal life.

By doing so much for individual happiness, this social spirit does no little for the wider and more generous feelings of benevolence and philanthropy. Men are never better inclined to assist others, than when they are pleased with themselves. The rays of personal good feelings are constantly diverging, and a happy man is made more happy by cheering, and smiling, and brightening countenances around him.

We remember, indeed, the declaration of the poet,

‘ Non ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco ’ ;

but while *past* calamity has a tendency to soften the heart, *present* gratification and tranquillity raise a tide of affection, which naturally flows in kindness and good will.

We hope, indeed, that the exceptions are not many to this position, because the most obvious remark to be made in regard to our domestic society is its state of perfect security. When we consider what is the amount of all those public evils of which the most fretful among us complain, as affecting individuals in society, we must certainly admit that they are few in number and inconsiderable in amount. Our state of internal tranquillity is almost unprecedented in the history of mankind. We have no foreign enemies ; the evils of war, the fears and anxiety which are inseparable from a state of hostility, are unknown to us. At home all is peaceable. There is no military array, no armed police, no domiciliary visitations. Crimes, which are calculated

to excite terror, are too rare among us to cause previous inquietude. Our people literally repose without any one to make them afraid. We do not mean to say that this fortunate condition of affairs does not produce the gratitude and sensibility that it ought ; but we think, when the condition of mankind from the beginning of the Christian era is considered, that so much cause for gratitude has never been accorded to any other people. The general state of prosperity, the flourishing condition of the great establishments which give opportunity for profitable industry, and the unexampled prevalence of health, throughout the country, combine to increase the motives for a rational sentiment of joy. It is obvious, therefore, that the dangers to which our society is exposed, are not those of calamity, but prosperity ; not of poverty, but affluence ; not those which threaten in the whirlwind and the storm, against which we may arm ourselves with courage and resolution as against open and determined foes, but those which are generated in sunshine under a summer sky, more insidious and delusive as they come in the soft breeze which we court for its salubrity, and steal upon us in the lassitude of that indolence and ease, to which we surrender ourselves without apprehension.

The existence of a given state of society, which they who live in it may alter at their pleasure, implies a satisfaction which secures its continuance. But many of its institutions remain, not because they are approved, but because no one is bold enough to break through them. They are ancient, and have custom and familiarity on their side ; and the risk of attacking them is too dangerous to be lightly essayed. We have no royal edict to change them, and no popular representation which has authority to reform them, and they continue by force of antiquity even against the inclination of an improved age.

Hence the spirit of society may not keep its appropriate place. It should do so. It should not be allowed to linger behind the improvements which learning and experience may introduce. It should be kept up to the expectations of an intelligent and educated people, and be made to advance the moral character and promote the happiness of the community.

Next to the general tranquillity, by which our society is distinguished, the most obvious appearance is its perfect

equality. No one class has any special immunities. Perhaps it might be more correct to say there is but one class among us. Differences exist to be sure in wealth, talents, education, taste, and by leisure for liberal or a necessity for laborious pursuits; but society has no distinctions in law, and no separation by caste. Every thing may be had by any body, who can acquire the means of procuring it; and the means are open to the efforts of each and all. These means are acquired too by chances and apparent accidents of extraordinary character, and the continuance of them beyond one or two generations of the same family is so efficiently prevented by our statute of distributions, that, though there are among us many rich men, and always will be so long as our prosperity continues, the class, as it exists in Europe, is here wholly unknown.

Privileges or possessions beyond what are bought and paid for are not only not possessed, but not even imagined; and those habits, manners, and inclinations, which distinguish a wealthy aristocracy, are absolutely, and we may say without any exception, unheard of. A class of men, living on their wealth and creating fictitious wants and desires which it is the occupation of other classes to supply, and marked from their fellow citizens, as a peerage of nabobs, has not yet been seen, and is not likely under our institutions ever to be seen in the United States. Our rich men have almost invariably something to do, in common with their fellow citizens. Without occupation, they would lose the respect of the community, and would get nothing in exchange for it. Their wealth is mingled with the common mass of the wealth of the people. It cannot be placed apart, and kept separate from the general fund. It must be and is exposed to all that agitates the community. The general prosperity of the country affects it; and in that general prosperity, therefore, our rich men are at least as much concerned as the laborer who toils for his daily subsistence. They cannot, if they would, separate themselves either in employment or amusement or inclinations from the body of the people. If an individual should have a different disposition, it would be impracticable to indulge it. No combination could be formed for such objects; and it was feelingly lamented by a gentleman of this description, that in Boston there was *no place to do nothing, and nobody to help do it.*

Property, perhaps, in all countries, is in some degree connected with the general condition of the people, and is more or less secure, and more or less productive, as the community is prosperous or depressed; but in the monarchical governments of Europe, there is a vast amount of property in the hands of rich men, which is not affected, or but very little affected, in this way. The enormous debt of the English nation, the extravagant pension list, and exorbitant hierarchal establishment, supply a permanent and unchangeable class of rich men with an annual income, the payment of which, power enforces, at whatever cost to the people. If commerce languishes, or agriculture is depressed, or the manufacturers starve, still these great demands on the means of the people are regularly levied, and the very misery of those who suffer, adds to the value of the property of those who possess. And they do receive their entire amount whatever be the suffering of the laborers from whose anguish and wretchedness it is wrung. The affluence that grows out of commercial or manufacturing operations is raised by the exertions of multitudes, whom it feeds, clothes, nourishes, and instructs; while the disproportionate revenues raised for the support of oligarchical stipendiaries in taxes and gratuities, impoverishes one class for the grandeur and dignity of another. The effect too is continued beyond its immediately perceptible limits. By taking away one half the food of the laborer, it extends the circle of the poor, and multiplies a class of dependent and miserable men, whom the more active capitalists must employ, and can, and of course do employ at a cheaper rate. Where then enormous wealth is drawn from the people for sinecures and proud establishments, hierarchal magnificence and government patronage, the laborious and industrious members of the community, who pay the amount, will be oppressed; and being oppressed, they will be driven into pauperism and crime, and the circle will enlarge from time to time and take in greater numbers. The established inequality of the different portions of the community will grow wider, and proceed from bad to worse. The limit of suffering at length will be reached, and a mighty revolution will throw off the oppressive weight that can no longer be sustained, and could not be moved but with violence and convulsion.

We have included the public debt of a nation in the causes

that are calculated to establish a monied aristocracy, but it is apparent that it can produce such a result, only when it is permanent in its character, and very great in amount. Its quantity and its durability united place its proprietors in a condition, where the ordinary fluctuation of public affairs does not reach them. They are then cut off from that sympathy with the people, which alone can make them essentially a part of the community. In such a condition of things there may naturally be entertained a strong jealousy of monied men; and it cannot be supposed that they who are clothed every day in purple and fine linen by those whose labor supplies the materials, while themselves and their own children are almost naked, can very well expect much regard and esteem.

We, too, have a public debt; but its amount is so small in comparison to the general wealth of the country, and it is so constantly diminishing by means of that republican policy that enforces its rapid extinguishment, that it cannot produce here any injurious operation. We have no hierarchy, and no pension list, and no sinecures; all the property of our richest men must therefore be placed in the general funds of an active, enterprising people, forming capital for productive industry, mingling in good or ill fortune with the condition of the country, and binding its proprietors by ties certainly not weaker than join their fellow citizens to the common welfare of the state.

If any jealousy or unfriendly feeling exists among us towards rich men, it is rather caused by the success of their efforts than by any disapprobation of honorable exertion; for certainly the most determinate and universal passion of our whole population is the desire of gain. We cannot deny that the characteristic of American citizens, and not the least of our New England community, is, in the first place, a desire to be well off in the world, and, next, to have the reputation of being so. This desire, which is the parent of that bold and daring enterprise, that patient and indefatigable industry, that firmness, and constancy, and perseverance, that prudence, and forethought, and calculation, that steadiness and sobriety, and orderly temperament, which have been enumerated among the virtues of our people, is also the mother of a less amiable family, whose children must be restrained and disciplined, if we would preserve the reputation of their

ancestry. If it is necessary to account for this universal disposition, which is blamable only in its excess, it may be said that our institutions as yet give little scope for distinction in any other way. The peerage and the church as hereditary establishments, do not exist with us. The army and the navy, as natural reservoirs for particular favorites, cannot be counted among our institutions. Literature and the arts do not offer much encouragement. Public trust and official station depend on the caprice of popular favor. Nothing seems within an individual's personal reach but the fortune, for which he must labor, first for existence, and then for celebrity. And it is this necessity that has inspired the universal disposition of which we speak. A great object with every individual is to earn his living. Patrimonial property is so subdivided, and, if it comes at all, ordinarily comes so late, that the necessity of personal exertion for a respectable support is, almost without exception, unavoidable. It is for this purpose education begins, and it is for this it is continued through the tedious period of pupilage. The necessity is apparent; the imperious obligation commences with lisping infancy; it is made, *ab ovo*, the grand business of life.

Now in this universal struggle it is impossible there should not be competition, rivalry, eager desire to come out well, anxiety to be speedily relieved from the toil. The hope of success, of great success, of success beyond that of the contending crowd, grows into a passion, which may too easily become the master-passion of the mind. Mortification at defeat, contrivance to conceal it, efforts to make small advantages appear large ones, and little losses less, are connected with the main object, until the powers of the mind, directed for a considerable period to one great scheme, finally accomplish even more from habit than was contemplated to be done by design.

The tone of our society is, we confess it with regret, too much regulated by the key note of wealth. The open and grosser marks which in other places are exhibited in base bribery and shameless corruption, have not, we trust and believe, as yet made their appearance among us; but if in this respect we have something left to be proud of, we cannot commit our institutions to the operation of the feeling, which has already been developed, or be satisfied that in its extension it would be found compatible with a republican gov-

ernment. *Omnia venalia sunt Romæ* cannot safely be inscribed on the portals of a free people.

In our community, wealth is pursued not so much for accumulation as display; not to be hoarded up for future employment, but lavished in present profusion; and the consequence is, that, though we escape the degradation of avarice, we are subjected to the inconveniences of extravagance. This disposition comes from another of our republican feelings, which, eminently honorable on the whole, may be liable to the beautiful observation of the heroine of *Mid-Lothian*, that 'there is always weal and wo with world's gear.'

Notwithstanding the perfect equality of our institutions, there is a constant impulse, in the community, to get each above the rest. We are all placed on the broad level of a perfect equality, but we are not contented to remain there long. We forbid, indeed, any artificial assistance from birth, or government, or hereditary rank, but the strife goes on, nevertheless, among ourselves. Some succeed, and some appear to succeed, but rather by their pecuniary success than in any other way. The evidence of this success is given out in display, in costly expenditure, in luxurious indulgence, in extravagance when it exceeds reasonable limits, and in generous liberality when it does not pass these bounds.

The consequence of this is a passion for dress, magnificent buildings, and showy entertainments. The first is almost universal, and, like most other dispositions of the human mind, has its advantages as well as its evils; its positive and desirable benefits, when regulated by sound judgment; its lamentable mischiefs, when it snaps the reins of discretion. It is beneficial, no doubt, by encouraging honest industry as the means of lawful indulgence; it gives employment to numerous useful classes, who minister in the saloons where fashion holds her court; it encourages elegant and useful arts, and gives our population a neatness and decency of appearance which generate kindred valuable qualities. There is a self-respect inspired by a creditable personal appearance, which has an effect on the manners, and even the character. Of the thirty thousand people of all ages, and sexes, and conditions of life, who thronged the streets of Boston on the second centennial celebration of its settlement, not an individual was to be seen who was not neatly, decently, and appropriately dressed.

It is, however, not to be doubted, that the disposition to extravagance, in this respect, is a little in advance of the means of its honest gratification, and that the sacrifices, at which it is indulged, are not unfrequently ruinous to character as well as fortune. When honest means will not answer the purpose, more doubtful ones are attempted; so that, for the sake of looking well, some of our young people have been willing neither to do well nor to be well. How far those, who have the unquestionable means, might control the tide of fashion, and how far they might feel willing to attempt such a task, we do not venture to decide; but we cannot doubt, that a little self-restraint, on their part, would be a valuable offering on the altar of their country. Women as well as men belong to the country, and have equal interest in its honor and prosperity. Their duties may be different, but equally imperative. They may not often be called to make bow-strings of their hair, or melt their gold and silver ornaments into coin. Like the women of the revolution, they may not be now called to make lint and prepare bandages for the wounded, or minister in hospitals to the suffering martyrs of freedom; but there is a daily beauty in their lives, which they are constantly bound to exhibit; a power over the taste and sentiment, the habits and manners, the inclinations, fashions, and mode of social intercourse, which they cannot better exert, than by the honorable example of diminished extravagance.

A servile imitation of the faded decorations and unseasonable fabrics of European invention, exhibits a national poverty of design, which is not to the credit of our genius. To import from the shops of London and Paris the pictures of a French opera dancer, or an English jockey, as models for our own ladies' and gentlemen's personal decorations; to exhibit here in August, what was there *en règle* in March; to display cast-off finery as a novelty, by which the charms of our beautiful countrywomen can be improved, is a folly so supremely ridiculous, that no quantity of impudence would have the audacity to propose it, if already it had not become familiar to us by inveterate usage.

If we follow our society into its associations of pleasure, we shall not, probably, be satisfied with its intellectual character. Some may be startled by a suggestion that literature and amusement could by possibility be connected. They go into company for relaxation, and not labor; they go to laugh, and

dance, and divert themselves, and not to study and recite their lessons, as if it was another period of school discipline. This is exactly the feeling on which we would animadvert. It implies a separation between the employment of intellectual beings and the gratification of their intellectual faculties, and demonstrates that they have yet something to learn, before they can arrive at the highest enjoyment of which their nature is susceptible.

We do not propose to hand round a waiter of psalm-books to a collection of men and women mingling in the circles of social intercourse, nor to interrupt the hilarity of gay spirits and buoyant feelings by stopping amusement and calling the company to prayers. To every thing there is a season, and this is not the time or place for acts of public devotion. But we boast of being an educated people ; and however pleasant or proper it may be to throw off the trammels of learning for occasional relaxation and amusement, regular appropriations of much time to listless vacuity of mind, to utter frivolity and folly, to useless, idle, unmeaning conversation, that has no merit while it is passing, and brings no gratification when it is past, is beneath the character of an educated community. With such modes of social entertainment as we are in the habit of sustaining, such a boast is a very unmeaning or a very extravagant gasconade. Of what consequence is it that we have schools of all kinds, from the infant school to the university, lectures and discourses in abundance, books every where, newspapers and pamphlets like leaves in Valombrosa, daily journals, weekly magazines, learned *monthlys*, and critical *quarterlys*, without end, if we find, nevertheless, that instruction is all labor, and learning hard work ; if we get rid of it as a trouble, as speedily as we may ; if we shake off our harness and delightedly roll on the green grass, like an over-worked animal, when he frees himself from the drudgery of his daily task ? If the results of education do not enter into the constant occupations of pleasure as well as business ; if they do not mix in with the affairs of common life, if they do not utterly unfit us for grossness and barbarity, and coarse and inelegant employment, if they are mere decorations, assumed as a sort of holiday dress, and put off and folded up the moment we get a chance to be free, they are not of the value they were supposed to be, and do little beyond serving as an excuse for the affectation of pretending to be pleased with them.

It is our opinion, that a cultivated intellectual society cannot find much gratification in reciprocating nonsense, and practising *gourmanderie*; and that where such occupations form the constituents of pleasure, the society, in which they are found, has little just pretension to intellectual distinction. We admit, that assembling in society is for amusement, and we not only concede, but maintain, that amusement is, in itself, as necessary to human virtue, as sleep is to human life; but amusement may be creditable or discreditable, elevated or low, intellectual or vulgar. Now, if it must be had, let it be had according to the taste and inclination of those who are to enjoy it; and do not let him, who finds and can find no pleasure in elegant conversation, seek to get amusement by trying to talk; if he finds all his sensibilities attracted to the supper-table, let him feast at it in moderation, and content himself with the refinements of oysters and champagne; but if this *is* the great cause of his entertainment, do not let him make any pretension to superiority of intellectual cultivation.

A better tone of society would change all this; and what now strikes us as a laborious and hard task, that of maintaining an easy, playful, elegant, and instructive conversation, an interchange of thoughts worthy to be remembered, and a developement of sentiment and opinion that might be remembered with satisfaction, would then become easy and popular. Instead of the costly display of materials for eating and drinking, disgusting by their quantity, and dangerous to the habits and character of the young and aged, whom they tempt beyond moderation, a lighter refection would soon become quite as satisfactory, and be vastly less prejudicial to health and to the mind. Let the dance go on, let music increase its fascinations, let youth enjoy its halcyon days, with all that can render life gay, cheerful, and happy; but take care, that in the excess of your kindness, you do not ruin the animated and lovely beings, whom you draw to a bright and shining light, that may destroy them.

Put no obstacle in the way of the enjoyment of every thing that wealth and liberality can contribute to divert the spirits, and gratify the imagination, and elevate the heart; but let it be remembered, that over all these preparations, the spirit of intelligence and discretion should preside; and that there can be no permanent happiness where there is a departure from pro-

priety. He is not the kindest friend, who pours forth the most liberally of his abundance, but he who so manages his contributions, that, while he promotes the innocent hilarity, he does not jeopardize the moral habits of the companions collected around him.

There is yet another circumstance in our state of society, which we have hardly left ourselves space to notice, and yet it cannot be passed over without at least a cursory remark. We mean the matter-of-fact calculation on which it is arranged. We are getting to be more dull, and grave, and phlegmatic, than is wise or prudent. The plan of our association is too strictly utilitarian. We prune off, and pare down, until the fruit, as well as foliage, is in danger of destruction. We are very little of an imaginative people. There is not much that seems to us expedient, unless its exact value is first mathematically ascertained. The may-pole and the liberty-pole are cut down; the sports and gambols of merry England, the jocund hilarity of beautiful France, the song, the dance, the improvisatore of romantic Italy, are out of season and out of climate; and our public days are too often days of disgraceful intemperance, because there are no national games, no lawful pleasurable pastimes, which may honestly be substituted for the daily labor of life. If a chaplet of flowers should be suspended over the grave of a departed friend, there would be no sympathy in the public mind to preserve them as the tribute of mourning affection; the first passer-by would wonder if it was thought the inanimate dust could be sensible of their perfume; they would be more likely to be stolen than to wither. Monuments of the dead can scarcely escape being mutilated in the mere wantonness of the folly or the ignorance of the gazers.

We have heard wonder expressed why our Chief Executive Magistrate marched in public procession with a military guard, when there was no danger of an enemy! In all the forms and ceremonies of civil and religious duty, a simplicity, almost on the Quaker plan, is encroaching on the rites and pageantry of former times.

A young couple went, not long since, into the study of a late Judge of our Supreme Court, who, by virtue of a commission as Justice of the Peace, was authorized to solemnize marriages, and desired him to marry them. 'Very well,' said his honor, whom they found writing, 'pass me your cer-

tificate, and you may go.' The man handed a certificate that the banns were published, but remained. The Judge continued his employment, until the impatient bridegroom again announced the intention of his visit. 'Very well,' said the Judge, and again pursued his task. After some further delay, the neglected applicants once more reminded his honor of their desire to be married. 'Why, go home,' said the magistrate; 'you have been married this half hour.' And it was true. The law only requires an acknowledgment of present intention before a Justice of the Peace, and a recognition of that intention by the Justice in his official capacity. There is no form of words necessary to the purpose, nor any ceremony, other than a simple declaration, which the Judge did not permit, for a moment, to disturb his meditation.

But we doubt whether this simplicity may not be carried too far. There is an avenue to the mind through the heart. The imagination excites the affections. Ceremonies, and parade, and decorations, and a pageantry which it would be difficult to justify by any syllogistic argument, have ever been found necessary to influence the conduct of mankind. No doubt these are supplements to weakness. Men are stronger and firmer who can do without them; but they are not wiser, who affect to do without them, and fail for want of their assistance. No doubt they may be excessive. The mummeries that have been practised on the credulity of mankind in other countries, have brought the whole system into contempt; and here, too, many a man has passed for a wise man, rather from the size of his wig than the capacity of his brain. But we are not intellectual enough to dispense with all the machinery that moves the mind. The passions, the affections, the imagination, are to be consulted as well as the reason. They are all parts of that complicated contrivance, by which the human will is to be influenced; they are the gifts of a Providence that has bestowed nothing in vain; they are not to be eradicated as noxious, or neglected as useless, but directed, and controlled, and employed, as necessary instruments in the formation of character and the promotion of happiness.

A little more attention to the matter we are considering, might, we think, be advantageously given by our temperance societies; for, we much mistake, if more than one half the excesses, which so lamentably degrade us, do not begin rather from the want of lawful and innocent objects of amusement,

than from any disposition for, or delight in, the intoxication itself.

We might have called our readers' notice to more amiable traits in our social intercourse, to finer and more accordant tones in the constant music of society, to the high sentiment of moral purity, which pervades it; to the reprehension and disgrace, which attend even the suspicion of departure from the chastity and honor of the sex; to its hospitality, its liberality, its noble and almost inexhaustible spirit of benevolence and charity. We might have exhibited splendid exceptions to the cases we have noticed, and portrayed, from living originals, bright pictures of its elegance, refinement, intellectual culture, and tender sensibility. But it is well, sometimes, to see the shades on the canvass. It is expedient, occasionally, to look at home with the severity with which strangers scrutinize us. We do not feel the less kindness for endeavouring to point out the means of being worthier of regard. With the philosophic poet we say, then,

‘Thee I account still happy, and the chief
Among the nations, seeing thou art free,
My native nook of earth! Thy clime is rude,
Thine unadulterate manners are less soft
And plausible than social life requires,
And thou hast need of discipline and art,
To give thee what politer France receives
From nature's bounties — that humane address
And sweetness, without which no pleasure is
In converse, either starved by cold reserve,
Or flush'd with fierce dispute. —
YET BEING FREE, I LOVE THEE.’

[For the Christian Examiner.]

The following Address, by Professor PALFREY, of Cambridge, though composed for a particular occasion, appeared to the Editors of this work to contain so much that was of general and permanent importance and interest, that they requested a copy for publication; which request was kindly complied with by the author. The form in which it was delivered has been retained, as it was believed that much of its spirit might be lost in giving it another shape.

THE EDITORS.

ART. V. — *An Address delivered before the Society for Promoting Theological Education, June 5, 1831.* By JOHN G. PALFREY, Professor of Biblical Literature in Harvard University.

YOU have assembled, my friends, at the invitation of the Society for promoting Theological Education, to attend to some exposition of its supposed claims to the favor and patronage of the community. These, without text or preface, I proceed to attempt to lay before you, not intending, as I go on, to avoid any details which may help to put you in better possession of the subject, and altogether passing over some topics forcibly presenting themselves, which might have more of general or of popular interest, than what I shall discuss, since I am mainly solicitous to make suggestions to meet the present object.

From the early part of the last century, Harvard College had possessed a professorship in theology; and, in the beginning of the present, by the bounty of a distinguished individual,* a lectureship in the same department had been established. The College also held funds for relieving the expenses of students preparing for the ministry. But the means of obtaining a suitable education for the sacred office being manifestly quite inadequate, the government of that institution, in a circular letter, addressed, in the year 1815, to some of its leading friends in different parts of the Commonwealth and elsewhere, called the attention of the community to the subject. Subscriptions were in consequence obtained to the amount of nearly thirty thousand dollars, and the contributors

* The Honorable Samuel Dexter.

formed themselves into a *Society for the Promotion*, — such was its title, — *of Theological Education in Harvard University*, under an agreement with the College that the fund should be in trust with the President and Fellows of that corporation, jointly with five individuals, chosen from year to year by the Society. A new professorship, that of Biblical Literature, was soon instituted, upon the basis of the lectureship previously existing, and the Divinity School assumed a form, and under the able care of the eminent men who filled its offices of instruction, its usefulness and importance rapidly increased. In the year 1824, a change took place in the relation of the Society of which I speak, to the College, by means of an agreement that the Directors of that Society should exercise an immediate control over the Divinity School, prescribing its course of study, and originating rules for its discipline, subject to the revision of the College government in all cases in which the constitution of the College should so require. Under this administration, the number of students was considerably enlarged; the foundation of a separate library was laid; and Divinity Hall was erected for the accommodation of students, with apartments for their different exercises and for lodging, and a third professorship, that of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care, was established, by means of new funds, obtained by the Directors from some of this community's numerous enlightened friends of piety and learning.

But inconveniences not anticipated manifested themselves under this system. The Directors found, that all the attention they could give to their trust, would but partially compensate the disadvantages under which they labored, in having other cares, to which precedence was due, living apart from the institution, and so wanting that opportunity for personal observation of its state, and acquaintance with its pupils, which were needful to the best administration of its concerns. Their representation to this effect was approved by the Society, who accordingly, last autumn, made a proposal to the government of the College, which was acceded to on its part, that the Society's connexion with the Divinity School, both in respect to right of superintendence through the Directors, and to obligation to contribute to its support, should be dissolved. The present object of the Society is expressed in its altered name. Its relation to the University having ceased, it sub-

sists as the Society for Promoting Theological Education, being now at liberty to use its discretion, in applying, in any quarter whatever, the means which may be entrusted to it for that purpose. The College government then proceeded to commit to the Theological Faculty, consisting of the President and three Professors, the same trust in the immediate management of the institution, which had hitherto been exercised by the Directors of the Society.

But, while this Society is now under no obligation to give to its funds one direction rather than another, except that, in the words of its Constitution, they must be appropriated 'for advancing the interests of pure Christianity, and promoting a liberal study of the Scriptures,' and 'so as that every encouragement shall be given to the serious, impartial, and unbiassed investigation of Christian truth,' and 'that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians shall ever be required,' — while, I say, it is no longer restricted, in the terms of its Constitution, as to the destination which its funds must take, it is my duty to add, that whatever means are at its disposal, until altered circumstances shall alter its apparent duty, will, in fact, be applied to the support of indigent and meritorious students of the Divinity School in Harvard University. Of the Divinity School, I say, in Harvard University, because I have reason to know that it is to that institution that the views of the government of the Society are, for the present, exclusively directed; and to the support of indigent and meritorious students of that school, because provision for this specific object is now its great want. Thanks to munificent benefactors, we have already a suitable building for them to lodge, and worship together, and be taught in. No further accommodation is needed, or likely to be immediately needed, of this kind. All departments of instruction belonging to a complete course of theological study, in its various branches, are likewise provided for, and the establishment of any new office is not at present desired, though the foundations for those which exist need to be enlarged, to place them on a sufficiently permanent footing. Lastly, the Faculty have recently been so fortunate as to effect an arrangement for relieving students from the heavy expense hitherto attendant upon the purchase of books, by furnishing to each, hereafter, at a small annual charge, the use, through his course, of a copy of every book necessary in pursuing the studies of

his class, with the exception, only, of the Old and New Testaments in the original tongues, which every student is required to possess. Having, then, the place for them to be instructed in, the teachers for them to be instructed by, and the books for them to be instructed from, all that we further want is, that they may have the means of living where this apparatus is prepared, in order that they may receive instruction; and this, in its bare simplicity, is the case which we have to bring before you.

Those who would know whether our application is a reasonable one, may wish to be satisfied upon the points proposed in the four following questions.

Why should ministers be educated at all?

If educated, why at a public institution?

If at a public institution, why at Harvard University, rather than at any other? and,

If at Harvard University, why at the public expense?

1. Why should ministers be educated men, as this Society would have them?

Because, without careful education, they will be incompetent to administer their office to the best satisfaction and edification of the churches. He who would communicate truth, must, of course, himself have become possessed of it; and he who would produce an effect on other minds, must be instructed in the proper arts of influencing them. The ministry are set for the defence of the Gospel, and it must be defended against learned opponents with learning, against ingenious opponents with logical power. It belongs to them to interpret it; and it is only abundant study, which can make them competent to the nicer investigations into its sense. It is their office to enforce its doctrines, laws, and sanctions; and this needs to be done by methods, for which, if right feeling and good sense may supply the materials, it is only application and practice that can mature the skill. Certainly; let those, who understand the Gospel, preach the Gospel. But it is one thing to understand it sufficiently for our own government as a rule of life, and another to be prepared to maintain its heavenly authority against all objections, to show its consistency against all misapprehensions, and to exhibit those most impressive and discriminating views of it, which have the freest and most powerful access to men's minds. I appeal to you, my friends, — and I well know how you will answer the

appeal, — whether you do not expect something more from a minister than to be able to use scripture language familiarly in some vague, or some unexamined, received sense, or to manifest an acquaintance, greater or less, with the common places of some controversy of the day. Entertaining no more worthy ambition, — trusting, and so liable to be self-deceived, — what is there to ensure you even that he will not be found to have handled the word of God deceitfully? And, granting that such expositions and illustrations as he attempts should chance to be mainly right, you do not think that it becomes a shepherd of souls to be willing to be right by chance, without certainty, and without the power of showing to others that he is so. Ministers among us have to do with many who will not be sent away without an answer, and who will not take an assertion, or a rebuke, or a sophism, in the place of one; — not only occasionally with unbelievers, who fully understand the force, and point, and bearing of objections which they urge, but often with believers, whose minds are painfully laboring under some doubt or superstition, from which they are entitled to the relief, that one mighty in the Scriptures might immediately afford; — with persons ignorant, but discerning, susceptible of the best impressions from instruction and argument, but yet knowing what thought, and meaning, and argument are, and on their guard against taking the shadow for the substance. They have concerns with the young mind; and they will have frequent occasions to perceive, that, scanty as its furniture yet may be, it is not merely a white table to be carelessly and incoherently written on; but that it has instincts of a most philosophical discrimination, which will shrink and reluct with a nicer sense than that of the rules of logic from every fallacy for which logic has, or has not, found a name. They have to preach to, and converse with, judicious, experienced, often well-read men, who expect that religious truth is to be set before them on grounds of evidence equally clear and cogent, with what they have been used to look for, and to find, for other truths; and that a consistency is to be shown between it and other parts of their knowledge, that so it may take its place in their minds among things of ascertained and tangible reality, and shed a light upon, and receive lights from, every thing else they know. I will not dwell upon the thought, — though if I should, it would not be altogether in a desponding spirit, for I rejoice, as in one of the brightest signs of the

times, that eminent laymen have taken up these studies, — the thought, that ministers may even need to be somewhat more on the alert, if they would not be outstripped by the better diligence of others, in their own proper course of intellectual exercise. Let it come to be once generally seen or believed, that they know less of their chosen business than others know, and even the task of suitably maintaining our religious institutions, hard enough in some places already, would begin to look like a desperate enterprise. But it is sufficient to say, that, for their own separate uses, and at all times, to meet the necessities of the individual souls for which they undertake to provide spiritual food, the churches demand a learned ministry. And more; there are those, not ministers, but wiser men, it may be, who think they perceive, that the disappearance of such a ministry would be a shivering blow upon the firmest foundation-stone of the community's quiet and prosperity.

I have confined myself in these remarks to a Christian minister's need of education for his office, in order to a fit discharge of its every-day duties, without adverting, because it was too large a subject to be incidentally introduced, to the obligation of the American clergy to use their advantages (in some important respects altogether unparalleled) for enlarging the limits of theological science. Remembering who those are whom I address, I will not further dwell on the topic which I have been treating, except to suggest, that, in the present state of things among us, it is peculiarly desirable, that the requisite mental furniture should be as largely provided as possible within the period of preparatory discipline. There has probably been no previous time when more stress has been laid than now upon the active duties of a minister, to the prejudice of his opportunities for study; when, to a greater degree than now, he was compelled to feel, that the brief intervals of time, which he passed among his books, were so much withdrawn from occupations, esteemed to have a stronger claim upon him. And as long as the prosecution of any regular system of study continues to be thus obstructed, the evil ought to be obviated, as far as may be, by accumulating the richest stock attainable of professional learning, during the preparatory course.

2. But, secondly, if ministers are to be educated, why

should this be at a public institution? Why not, as was formerly the practice, under the care of a private clergyman?

I suppose, my hearers, that no one can consider the subject, and not allow that the practice referred to, was merely the use of a very imperfect expedient, as long as no better was to be had. The question is not at all, whether among the parish clergy are to be found the most eminent men in the profession, nor even, whether in their ranks appear the individuals the most apt to teach others. But it is, whether there is any one, who is qualified to give alone the best instruction in every department; who can command the time, from his parochial cares, to do it; who, in addition to the resources of his own mind, can offer the various other advantages for needed study and practical exercise; and who collects around him a sufficient number of students to exert the proper action on one another. Here are brought to view the obvious advantages of a public institution. In all departments of instruction, its pupils have the aid of teachers, who, while they will generally have enjoyed the benefit of previous practical experience of the ministry, are selected on account of their supposed peculiar interest, each in his own department, and separated from other cares, to the end that all their powers and endeavours may be devoted to giving, and qualifying themselves to give, the best assistance in that walk. Again; it is quite plain that it is only in a public establishment that that collection of means can be made, by which this education is to be most advantageously conducted. In the wide range, which the study of divinity now takes, and which it is greatly undesirable should be narrowed, it is necessary to have access, regularly to a considerable number, and occasionally to a very large number, of books. Further; unless all observation has deceived us, the power of sympathy and the benefit of coöperation among persons engaged in the same pursuit are extremely great; and the interest of a number of students prosecuting their inquiries apart will be very cold, and their progress very slow, and their conclusions for the most part, general and loose, compared with those of the same number collected together, acting on each others' minds and hearts, interchanging their different views, and thus clearing, correcting, and enlarging them, and mutually excited by the power of good example, and of that degree of emulation,

which is consistent with generous feelings. Lastly; the friendships which under these circumstances will naturally be formed, are auspicious of the greatest good to the church, affording foundation for future effective coöperation in worthy common objects, and extending a mutual interest and good understanding, and a sense of mutual dependence and obligation, through the distant communities of worshippers of the same Lord.

3. If there be allowed to be reason in these remarks, then, thirdly, as a place of resort for our youth destined to the sacred office, why should the Divinity School of Harvard University be preferred to other institutions having the same object?

I will not urge, in reply, any sentiment, in which numbers of my hearers might however be found to sympathize, of veneration for a spot, to which are attached so many glowing associations in the minds of this community; whence from generation to generation a noble spirit of intelligence and honor has gone abroad among them, and defenders and benefactors been bountifully supplied; and to which still their affections, if ever for a season they seem estranged, soon turn back, as if instinctively, with a reanimated warmth. I will proceed at once to the great consideration, — a proud if a painful one, — that, unlike every other institution of the kind, with which we are acquainted, — no restriction is placed, at that of which we speak, on the freest scriptural inquiry, on the part either of pupil or teacher. It suffers no violence to be done to the Protestant principles of the sufficiency of God's word, and the right of private judgment; principles, which if we did not know how complex is the mental constitution of man, we should say were not more at the root of intelligent belief than at that of vital piety. It neither calls on the young themselves, nor sets to them the bad example of requiring their guides, to submit their faith to human dictation; to profess their subjection to formularies of man's device; — least of all, to engage to follow the light which the book of divine truth may disclose, no further than to a prescribed point. Here appears a decisive consideration, though all others should incline the other way, why this institution should be preferred as an object of favor and patronage, by those who deem highly of the rights of the mind, and think that above all

things, it ought to be left free to adopt and profess the convictions which Scripture and divine grace may convey to it. If it be true, that here there is no restraint of human creeds, and that at every other institution of the kind in our land, there is such restraint in some form, this, I say, is a commanding reason for the choice of it, among similar objects of patronage, by those who set a high value on the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free.

And, in one view, I cannot but think that this consideration will be seen, by reflecting men, to address itself with special urgency to their sense of personal, and their regard for the public interests. The principles, which fortify one in asserting and using his own liberty of conscience, are of course the same, which will lead him to respect and uphold that liberty in others; and therefore they, who are jealous of encroachment on their freedom of thought, may well be concerned to have the churches provided with a ministry sensible to the mischiefs and the unjustifiable character of any attempt at such encroachment. True; such men may say, that they are secured against spiritual usurpation by the laws. But how far secured? They are protected only from that, from which the partially reformed state of public sentiment in these times would alone protect them. They can neither be imprisoned, fined, banished, nor burned, for thinking for themselves, as in other times they might have been. But the peace of such men is assailable in another way, where the laws find a much greater difficulty in protecting it, and where public sentiment has by no means reached that correctness and delicacy which are to be desired. I ask how a man is to be secured in the possession of his good name, and of those various social advantages which depend upon the respectful estimation in which one is held, and at the same time in the free exercise of his right of private judgment in questions relating to the salvation of his soul. You answer, By the prevalence of an enlightened spirit of toleration in the community. I assent to this, and inquire again by what means that spirit is to be produced and maintained. The reply must be, that it is to be produced and maintained, in great part, at least, by the instructions and examples of a truly liberal clergy. The influence of independent and enlightened men, in other walks of life, upon religious sentiment, is certainly not inconsiderable. But that of the clergy upon the religious

community is still more distinctive and direct. The better part of them are now, as they have been in other periods of the church, the efficient champions of toleration. On the other hand, when they have the inclination, there is not wanting among them power to frame a plausible argument for intolerance, nor resolution to set an example by acting up to their reasonings; and their influence will be the greatest upon precisely those minds which are already the most disposed to bigotry,—upon the narrow and uninformed. In this favored place, my hearers, you will say that you experience little of this evil. But why not? Look at the condition of other places, more populous, more prosperous, possibly not less intelligent, and with not less, perhaps, of the form of godliness; and you may see reason to allow that your comparative exemption can be considered as resulting from nothing more than the labors and example of a truly Christian clergy through a long course of years. But the evil might be set before you in the most palpable shape, if you should be led into many villages even of this Commonwealth, so far advanced before most others in right religious sentiment. You might be shown even there that denunciations for difference of religious opinion, such as when you read, afford you only amusement, if they afford you that, are a most serious affliction to most worthy men; not only wounding them, but crossing their honorable path; touching them in their business,—nay, following them to their firesides. A sort of mark is set upon them, until, in the progress of inquiry, they become numerous enough to introduce a different specimen of the Christian ministry among them; and from that time the spirit of bitterness is rebuked, and waxes fainter and fainter. Who is content with the enjoyment of those rights which alone the law assures to him? Who sets light by those which are only accorded by an enlightened moral sense in the public mind? If you rejoice in your own exemption from the scourge of the tongue, and its attendant evils, you will reasonably desire to have it perpetuated as it was first obtained. If you sympathize with those who endure such evils, you will naturally desire that something may be done for their relief; and both these objects are to be effected, in unison with all other religious objects, by the labors of a clergy,—I do not say, entertaining one or another belief on controverted questions, of this I am not at all now speaking,—but a clergy imbued with

the free, and enlightened, and charitable spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ; and such a clergy, thank God, whatever opinions they may go forth with, there is nothing in the institutions of Harvard University to prevent from being formed there; nor, as long as the people of this Commonwealth understand their duty and interest as well as hitherto they have uniformly understood them, is it to be feared that there ever will be.

You perceive, then, my friends, distinctly, on what ground I venture to rest the claim of preference for this institution over others with a similar design. I do not say that pupils will go forth from us into the Gospel vineyard with a better furniture of learning than from other schools; — though as to other advantages collected for their use, they are evidently great, and to the ample eulogy, which, were my relations different, I could not refrain from pronouncing on the worth of the labors of my colleagues, I know that the public voice would cordially respond. I do not say that our pupils will go forth more devoted to their work than others, or with more of their Master's spirit; though I trust in God it will be our never-ceasing endeavour to make them, not subjects of a scholastic discipline merely, but competent, engaged, diligent, useful ministers of Jesus Christ; to excite them to a disinterested and self-denying, — if I may say it, to an apostolic fidelity and zeal, in the conduct of their great work. I am persuaded that numbers of excellently disposed young persons go forth into the ministry from other places of instruction, nor do I call in question this character as belonging to any whom they furnish. But, I repeat it, it is unhappily the apparent tendency of the standing regulations themselves of other such establishments, to reconcile the mind to wearing and imposing fetters, which it intimately concerns the public and the church that men should not desire or consent to put on; while the rules of the institution, now recommended, go alike in their letter and their spirit to make it a point of conscience with those whom it forms, to recognise and assert others' Christian liberty, while they prize and use their own.

4. The last inquiry proposed was; If candidates for the ministry are to be prepared at the Divinity School of Harvard University, why is this to be with public aid? To this I answer; because the public wants their services, and because, without such aid, it cannot have them.

The public wants their services. These churches, — your churches, my friends, — are accustomed to look to that source for a supply, whenever, in providence, their places of pastoral instruction are made vacant. You who feel what the worth of a competent and devoted ministry is, you can realize with what solicitude you would be turning your eyes thither, should the light in which you and yours are now rejoicing be displaced or quenched; and, as to all of you, or of those who shall succeed you, this privation must repeatedly come, you perceive what a strong individual concern each may reasonably feel to see this institution even now in a prosperous state, and such numbers resorting to it as may afford a promise that the standard of ministerial character will be henceforward continually rising, and the wants of all the churches be anticipated, if it may be, by a liberal supply. But anticipated it is altogether impossible that they should be, for a very long time to come. To the extent of the suggestion which I am about to make, I am aware that there are some who think it cannot be sustained. But this has only led me to examine the grounds of it more attentively, and the result has been a more complete conviction of its justness. I am persuaded, then, that if we could forthwith send out a hundred candidates for the ministry from the Cambridge school, of average pretensions, every one of them might be placed in some desirable situation of usefulness before a year should expire. This, I repeat it, is my own deliberate conclusion, from such facts as have come within my knowledge, relating to the demand for services of the kind which they render. Some churches send for candidates till they are weary of sending, and in discouragement are either dissolved, or invite some one whose doctrines and manner of ministration would repel them, had they any other resource. Other organized churches are prevented from making the application, by being told that it would be in vain. Others, all ready and anxious to organize themselves, stop short of this step for the same reason; and in a still greater number of neighbourhoods, through the length and breadth of our continent, well known to be ripe for it, and to be able to maintain, and ardently longing to possess, a religious institution such as they are sure would profit their souls and their children's, and make this earth a place of far more happiness as well as improvement to them and others, the movement is never made, for the same reason of the deficiency of this supply.

While the public is so interested in the provision in question, — while the church so wants and craves it, — while a hundred candidates for the ministry, or as many less as any one may suppose, would only satisfy the present demand, — only ten are to be dismissed from this school this year, and the number, if my recollection be not erroneous, has not commonly, perhaps scarcely ever, been so great. Why is this? I do not say that I shall assign the only reason, in recurring to the remark which I just now made on the necessity of further pecuniary aid. One other, and even a more considerable reason, — but one, however, which we cannot obviate, — is, that the influence exerted on students' minds at most other colleges where young men obtain their preparation to enter on theological studies, is such as to disincline them to come hither to conduct those studies. A few pupils have of late been furnished us from the colleges of Rhode Island and of Maine; but while, as hitherto, the sole or principal supply has been from the graduates of Harvard College, and while a fifth, or certainly a quarter part of each class graduated there, would be a large proportion to be found devoting themselves to the ministry, and while some of those who do, — owing to the free spirit of the place, which exempts them from the necessity of any doctrinal bias, — are found with such opinions as lead them to seek their further education elsewhere, we cannot be at a loss for one reason why the number of our students has been as yet so small.

But another reason is more to our present purpose. The public, which wants this supply, has something to do towards providing it. Not every thing; — that I am very far from saying. Towards great part of the needful provision, my friends, it is quite evident that you can take no step. The providence of God must furnish talent; and for the disposition to devote it to this work, and for that spirit of piety and zeal which this work demands, the churches must consent to be indebted to the divine grace, to the instructions of devout parents, to the efforts of the ministry already existing, and to the self-discipline of religious young men. If a competent ministry is to be perpetuated, young men, from generation to generation, must present themselves for the service of the churches with the most essential part of their preparation already made. It is only the finishing part, the

intellectual and practical part of that preparation, which others can have an agency in giving; and, when the rest must of necessity be provided for them, will they lose the benefit of it, when it has been provided, by neglecting to do what is further needful to make it available to their use?

I trust, my friends, that, whatever interest I may take in this subject, I have not lost the power of discriminating upon it. I should greatly hesitate to urge before you the claims of what are called Education Societies;—societies which, finding a young man at the plough or in the work-shop disposed to change his calling for that of a minister, take him up, and carry him at little or no present expense to himself, through all the steps of his preparation for that office. With whatever caution administered, I should tremble to think of the possible effect of such societies to provide a mercenary ministry. To a young man in the humbler walks of industry, becoming a minister appears to be bettering his condition; and when this can be done chiefly at others' cost, the temptation cannot but be strong, and the minds of such be subjected to a powerful bias to suppose themselves directed to this employment by a religious motive, when, if they examined more closely, they might find it only a worldly calculation. I would have our charity reserved from such an equivocal, not to say, hurtful, use, for the assistance of those who have completed their course of literary education. With such an education, a person seems out of reach of the temptation to engage in the ministry for the sake of advancing himself. It would be bold to affirm that, in this country, where such prizes are held out to talent and information, any well educated young person betakes himself to the ministry for the sake of a living. There is no other employment, that engages eminent men, in which the compensation,—since the argument compels us to speak of such things,—is in so small proportion to the labor. If a young man, with his literary education finished, be merely mercenary, rely upon it he will not become a minister. He can do better. He will devote himself to one of the lucrative professions. Or, if he have not courage for the hazards of these, he has a sure resource in the business of instruction, where his knowledge, used with less pains, will command a higher price, and his situation, under the present circumstances of

the greater part of our churches, — those, I mean, in our country towns, will be generally more secure.

If, then, a young man, with his literary education completed, is beyond being bribed into the ministry by the mere facilities of education for it, it is safe to render him assistance in obtaining that education. I conceive that it is also greatly for the interest of the churches. In all ages, the church has drawn some of its brightest ornaments from the poorer, at least not the richer, portion of society; and though, among ourselves, there have been, from the earliest times to the present, an uncommon number of instances of a different sort, it is still from that source that the supply is likely, in no inconsiderable part, to be furnished. A young man, so circumstanced, commonly leaves college embarrassed by a debt, which it is his first object to discharge. To effect this, he engages in the business of instruction; and, this accomplished, it is reasonable to expect that he will continue in that business, or adventure in some other, unless they are truly upright views which impel him to the Christian ministry. He has moreover shown a competency to it in one respect, in the resolution with which he has struggled through the embarrassments of his previous course; and is known to be so far worthy of aid. If aid be afforded him, the church has soon the accession of a minister, at least conscientiously disposed to the work. If it be not, he either abandons the object in discouragement, or at least, while he is obtaining the means of prosecuting it, some of the most active years of his life are lost to the great object to which he desires it should be devoted; and does not either side of this alternative deserve the care of Christians to prevent it?

[The remainder of the discourse was chiefly taken up with statements relating to the condition and wants of the school, during the academic year which is now closed. It may be proper here merely to mention, that the necessary annual expenses of a student are estimated at two hundred dollars, including personal charges of every kind, as well as sixty-six dollars paid in term-bills for instruction, rent and care of room and furniture, and use of text-books. Fourteen students were aided last year from the funds, receiving an average allowance of eighty-three dollars each. Of the sum thus appropriated, six hundred and thirty dollars were fur-

nished from the Hopkins foundation. The other chief resources have been hitherto the bounty of individuals associated for the purpose in different religious societies of Boston, Salem, and Charlestown, and the contributions taken at the annual meeting of the Society for Promoting Theological Education. The number of applications for aid was last year unusually small; and, from particular circumstances, the collection was imperfectly made. It is greatly desirable, that the number of members of the Society for promoting Theological Education should be enlarged, and especially that the attention of liberal benefactors should be turned to the establishment of permanent scholarships, yielding an income of one hundred and fifty dollars each.]

ART. VI. — *A New Translation of the Book of Psalms, with an Introduction.* By GEORGE R. NOYES. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1831. 12mo. pp. xxviii, 232.

OF all the books that were ever known among men, the one which has been most read, most repeated, most translated, versified, quoted, imitated, got by heart, studied, and sung, is doubtless that collection of Hebrew poems, called the Book of Psalms. And this is no wonder. There never was a book so eminently calculated to engage human affection. Praise to God, in the most sublime and elevated strains; confession, complaint, and supplication the most humble and touching; thanksgiving the most ardent; expressions of joy, hope, triumph, confidence, and trust, and of grief, fear, despondency, and pain, the most lively and natural; descriptions of the works of God the most beautiful and true; devotion in all its depth and variety of manifestation, are all embodied in this book. If we would exalt the majesty of the Most High, we cannot do better than borrow language for the purpose from the Psalms. If we would magnify his loving-kindness and mercy, there are no words which will more adequately speak the feelings of our hearts than those which we may find in the Psalms. And how can the great truths and mysteries of life and death, the

blessedness of the righteous, and the misery of the wicked, the swiftness of time and the brevity and vanity of our mortal years, be set forth with more strength and pathos, than by adopting verse after verse from the Psalms?

To all this power of thought and language is to be added the power of music; for the Psalms are sacred songs, and were at first intended to be, and from the first have been sung, in every age of the Jewish and Christian churches, and in the original and numerous other tongues. The chords of passion and the melodies of the human soul, which they strike and wake, have been accompanied by the sound of trumpet and harp, of psaltery and the loud cymbals, of the later organ, and the yet diviner voice of man. What a rich and glorious cloud of harmony must have pervaded the great temple at Jerusalem, as the triumphant ode was shouted and shouted back from one bright-robed company of Levites to another, or the plaintive dirge was wailed forth in alternate stanzas, and died away among the far porches and courts! And when there was no more any temple at Jerusalem, and its Priests and Levites were dispersed, and its instruments of music were broken, the Psalms which had been sung there ceased not, but had as intense a life as before, springing warmly from Christian lips, as the first feeble but dauntless bands of Nazarenes met to show forth the death of their Master, or as afterwards the splendid churches of their dominant faith echoed to the ancient Songs of Zion. And from those times to these, when or where has Christian worship been without them? In the Greek church, and the Roman, and the English, they have constituted an important part of their respective liturgies. In lofty cathedrals they have been chanted, as in the Temple of old; in humble parish churches and remote village meetinghouses, they have been sung wherever two or three have been gathered together; they have gone up daily and nightly from convent shades and hermit cells, and from the closets of those who have taken on themselves no vows but those of their silent consciences and devoted hearts.

Thus recommended by intrinsic excellence and by the most interesting associations, the book of Psalms has always been regarded with veneration and affection, and spoken of in terms of almost unqualified eulogy. In the preface to the '*Psalterium Americanum*,' a curious translation, printed

in Boston more than a century ago,* the writer says, 'The commendations which the ancients gave of this unparalleled book, are as high as the tongue of man can carry them; and the commendations would not be too high, if the tongue of angels who possessed the writers of this book, were employed for the giving of them. Let Chrysostom and Basil alone be called in, to declare unto us the sense of all the rest! Chrysostom, who calls this wonderful book *The Christian Panoply*; and Basil, who styles it *The Common Treasure of all good Precepts*, and *A complete Body of Divinity*.' 'There have been,' he says in another place, 'profane, foolish, empty pretenders to literature, who have had no great relish for the Psalms of David. But with men who have had a just sense, a true gust of things, no writings in the world have been so relished as these matchless gifts of Heaven unto the children of men.' One more extract from this quaint writer may not fatigue our readers. 'Theodoret informs us, the people in his time were so well acquainted with our Psalms, that both in city and country it was the usual employment of all Christians *to sing them*; and even they who had little acquaintance with any other book of the Sacred Scriptures, yet so had the Psalms by heart, as to recreate themselves with singing them in the streets, and in the fields, as well as in their houses. And verily, these marvellous poems have not by their age lost any thing of their spirit or their goodness. The Christians in our days

* The title of this book, now scarce, is as follows: '*Psalterium Americanum. The Book of Psalms, in a Translation exactly conformed unto the Original; but all in Blank Verse, fitted unto the Tunes commonly used in our Churches. Which pure Offering is accompanied with Illustrations digging for hidden Treasures in it; and Rules to employ it upon the glorious and various Intentions of it. Whereto are added some other Portions of the Sacred Scripture, to enrich the Cantional.* Boston: in N. E. Printed by S. Kneeland, for B. Eliot, S. Gerrish, D. Henchman, and J. Edwards, and sold at their shops. 1718.' The 'Blank Verse' of this translation is certainly the blankest we ever read. The verses which follow, being the ninth and tenth of the 65th Psalm, are a fair specimen of the whole book. — 'The earth with rain thou visitest || after that thou hast made || it to desire the rain, thou dost || enrich it mightily. || The river of God with waters is || richly replenished; || Thou dost prepare them corn; 'tis so || that thou preparest it. || Water its ridges plenteously; || On 't's furrows O descend; || With show'rs thou mak'st it soft; Thou dost || bless what does spring from it. ||' How could human ears, in any age, bear this?

may as well feed and live upon them, and *eat the bread of angels.*'

We certainly shall not agree with our ancient friend, in calling this book 'an unparalleled book,' and a 'matchless gift of Heaven unto the children of men,' while we remember that we have the books of the New Testament, and while some parts of the Psalms seem to us to be little fitted for Christian or modern use. But 'marvellous poems' the Psalms undoubtedly are; and being metrical compositions, of convenient length, of an exciting, warming, and affecting character, and calling in the aid of music, will probably always be, as they surely have hitherto been, more used as a whole, and in various ways, than any other compositions, sacred or profane. Perhaps the most beautiful encomium which has been bestowed on them, is that which was pronounced by Bishop Horne, which is quoted by Mr. Noyes in his Introduction, and part of which we here requote. 'In them,' says he, 'we are instructed to conceive of the subjects of religion aright, and to express the different affections which, when so conceived of, they must excite in our minds. They are, for this purpose, adorned with the figures, and set off with all the graces of poetry; and poetry itself is designed yet further to be recommended by the charms of music, thus consecrated to the service of God; that so delight may prepare the way for improvement, and pleasure become the handmaid of wisdom, while every turbulent passion is calmed by sacred melody, and the evil spirit is still dispossessed by the harp of the son of Jesse.' This allusion to the influence of David's youthful minstrelsy over the perturbed spirit of Saul, is one of the happiest applications of Scripture history.

The argument which may be drawn from the extraordinary excellence of the Hebrew Psalms, in support of the divine origin of the Jewish law, and the reality of the revelations alleged to have been made to the Jewish people, is thus forcibly stated by Mr. Noyes.

'Let the unbeliever compare the productions of the Hebrew poets with those of the most enlightened periods of Grecian literature. Let him explain how it happened, that in the most celebrated cities of antiquity, which human reason had adorned with the most splendid trophies of art, whose architecture it is now thought high praise to imitate well, whose sculpture almost gave life to marble, whose poetry has never been surpassed, and

whose eloquence has never been equalled, a religion prevailed so absurd and frivolous, as to be beneath the contempt of a child at the present day; while in an obscure corner of the world, in a nation in some respects imperfectly civilized, were breathed forth those strains of devotion, which now animate the hearts of millions, and are the vehicle of their feelings to the throne of God. Let him say, if there be not some ground for the conclusion, that, whilst the corner-stone of the heathen systems of religion was unassisted human reason, that of the Jewish was an immediate revelation from the Father of lights.' — p. v.

Such being the popularity, the influence, and the divinity of the Psalms, it is a matter of great moment that we should have them well and faithfully translated. With the poetical versions of them which we possess, we are abundantly satisfied. We own that we do not believe that they will ever be better versified in English, than they have already been by Tate and Brady, Watts, Doddridge, Merrick, and Montgomery; from whom a perfectly satisfactory collection may be made of all those Psalms and portions of Psalms, which are suitable to be sung in Christian churches and assemblies. But when we speak of a translation, we mean a translation of the whole book, which shall be both faithful and elegant, and which shall amend those passages of the common translation which are either rude, incorrect, or unintelligible. Such a translation has been long wanted by the Christian community, and such a one has, in our opinion, just been presented to it by Mr. Noyes, who had before shown himself equal to such a work by his admirable translation of the Book of Job. Of the two books, the translation of the Psalms was the most needed; not, however, because the common version of the Psalms is inferior to that of Job, but because the Book of Psalms is, and must necessarily continue to be, in far more general use than the Book of Job.

But why should we not be contented with the common version of the Psalms? Is it not good English? Is it not for the most part intelligible? Does it not abound in passages of exceeding beauty? Is there not enough in it to make us feel, and enough to make us wise and holy? A cheerful and grateful affirmative may be returned to all these interrogatories. For the great purposes of piety, for worship, and for duty, the common version is sufficient. There is no need of a new version to make us understand the morality of the First Psalm,

from its beginning to its end, nor to make us feel the tender and trusting piety of the Twenty-third, from the first verse, 'The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want,' to the last, 'Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.' And so with many others. We go further than this. We say that we should be prejudiced against any translator who should widely depart from the old simplicity of such a Psalm as is the Twenty-third in the common version. We should mourn over the aberration. From such a specimen of his taste, we should be led to suspect the correctness of his taste altogether. But in a translation of this or any other portion of the Scriptures, is all we want, all we ought to ask for, a general faithfulness to the original, a general intelligibility? Shall we be satisfied to have many things poorly and clumsily expressed, and many expressed so ambiguously or unmeaningly that they might as well have been left in the Hebrew? No. We want the whole translated, and as well translated as possible; and as the common version is encumbered with not a few defects, what we require in a new translation, is, that while it effects no needless alteration, and preserves every former beauty, it shall clear away those defects, and make what was rough smooth, and what was obscure plain, and what was unintelligible not hard to be understood. This has been accomplished, in a remarkably satisfactory manner, in the translation before us. Wherever the common version approved itself to good taste and sound criticism, its language has been for the most part retained. In such a Psalm as the Twenty-third, to offer it again as an instance, a change of two or three words only is made. We read nothing perceptibly different from what we have been accustomed to read. So with the Nineteenth, 'The heavens declare the glory of God'; so with several other whole Psalms, and with verses and passages in all the Psalms. But where the common version was found to be faulty, it has been amended according to the judgment of the present translator. A few examples, casually selected, may show the value of these improvements, as well as the need there was of improvement.

In the Sixteenth Psalm, second and third verses, we read in the common version thus; '*O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my goodness extendeth not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excel-*

lent, in whom is all my delight.' What idea does a plain reader receive from the assertion, that the Psalmist's goodness extended not to the Lord, but to the saints that are in the earth? The new translation relieves his perplexity by the following simple lines.

'I have said to Jehovah, Thou art my Lord;
I have no happiness without thee!
The holy that are in the land, and the excellent,
In them is all my delight.'

In the common version of that exquisite Psalm, the Forty-second, beginning 'As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God,' there are many lines which no one would wish to see altered, or need to have explained. But in the seventh verse we read, '*Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts: all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me.*' We know, indeed, from many other places in the Scriptures, that great afflictions are represented under the similitude of overwhelming waters, just as in our own language we say 'floods of grief' to express great sorrows; and therefore we want no explanation of the second clause of this verse. But this does not assist us in getting at the meaning of the first clause, 'Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts.' When we open the new translation, we are at once enlightened, for we read there,

'Deep calleth for deep; thy cataracts roar;
All thy waves and billows have gone over me.'

The Fifty-eighth Psalm is an invective of David against wicked rulers. In the ninth verse we find the following obscure language, '*Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in his wrath.*' The translation of Mr. Noyes, together with the note appended to this verse, gives us ideas instead of mere sounds.

'Before your pots feel the heat of the thorns,
Whether fresh or burning, they shall be blown away.'

The note informs us that 'This verse contains a proverb, of which the meaning is, Your plans shall be defeated, or shall indeed have no chance of succeeding. The proverb is probably drawn from fires made in the desert for culinary purposes, which the wind sometimes destroyed.'

Psalm Seventy-fourth is a lament, or mournful plea with God, on account of the desolation of the temple, either by the

Babylonians or Chaldeans, and other grievous afflictions of the Hebrew nation. It begins, in the common version, 'O God, why hast thou cast us off for ever? why doth thine anger smoke against the sheep of thy pasture? Remember thy congregation, which thou hast purchased of old; the rod of thine inheritance, which thou hast redeemed; this mount Zion, wherein thou hast dwelt.' So far it is sufficiently intelligible. '*Lift up thy feet*' it thus proceeds, in the third verse, '*unto the perpetual desolations, even all that the enemy hath done wickedly in the sanctuary.*' Here, too, the reader may possibly understand the meaning of the Psalmist, and perceive that the help of the Lord is called to the desolate and violated condition of the temple; but he will not perceive it by any means so readily as he will in the new translation, which gives the verse thus;

'Hasten thy steps to those utter desolations;
Every thing in the sanctuary the foe hath abused!'

Nor will he comprehend the fourth verse in the common translation, '*Thine enemies roar in the midst of thy congregations; they set up their ensigns for signs,*' so distinctly as when it is rendered to him as in Mr. Noyes's translation,

'Thine enemies roar in the place of thine assemblies;
Their own symbols have they set up for signs.'

But when he comes to the fifth verse, in connexion with the sixth, he will, in all probability, be entirely at a stand. He will read, '*5 A man was famous according as he had lifted up axes upon the thick trees. 6 But now they break down the carved work thereof at once with axes and hammers.*' What relation, he may exclaim, what manner of relation has the former verse with the latter, and what can the former mean? The following translation will immediately bring him out of palpable obscurity into clear light.

'5 They appeared like those who raise the axe against a thicket;

6 They have broken down the carved work of thy temple with axes and hammers.'

Not only is the darkness now cleared away, but a graphic delineation is introduced into the place where the darkness had been. The bands of sacrilegious invaders are shown to us among the tall columns and richly carved tracery of the temple, laying about them with their instruments of destruc-

tion, and are compared to a company of wood-cutters, seen plying their work amidst the living pillars, arches, and foliage of a forest. The picture which is thus suddenly brought into the light, the figure which thus leaps out of obscurity, are of the most striking description. Instead of groping and hesitating in an unknown place, we are brought at once into the reality of a moving and resounding scene.

In that fine and solemn Psalm, the Ninetieth, which is ascribed to Moses,* and which is used in the Episcopal Burial Service, the beauty of the passage beginning, 'The days of our years are threescore years and ten,' and consisting of the tenth and two following verses, is much marred, as we have always thought, by the mistiness of the eleventh verse; '*Who knoweth the power of thine anger? even according to thy fear, so is thy wrath.*' Nor is this rendering much improved in the old version retained in the Book of Common Prayer; though the first clause of the verse is correct. '*But who regardeth the power of thy wrath? for even thereafter, as a man feareth, so is thy displeasure.*' The last clause is as obscure as in the common version. But let us read the whole passage as we find it in the new translation, substituting, however, 'weariness' for 'weakness,' which we understand to be an error of the press.

- 10 The days of our life are seventy years,
And, by reason of strength, may be eighty years;
Yet is their pride weariness and sorrow;
For it vanisheth swiftly, and we fly away.
11 Yet who attendeth to the power of thine anger?
Who, with due reverence, regardeth thine indignation?
12 Teach us so to number our days,
That we may imbue our hearts with wisdom!

Here the sense flows on uninterruptedly and affectingly. We are not coldly stopped, after the pathetic truths of the tenth verse, to question the signification of the eleventh, but are rather brought to apply its serious and searching inquiries to our own souls.

* For the gratification of those who may like to see what sort of 'hidden treasures' the author of the *Psalterium Americanum* spent his time in 'digging for,' we subjoin the following portion of a note on this Psalm. 'One of the Ancients has a pious fancy here. The name of Moses is, *One drawn from under the waters*. And so, says he, *This is a Psalm especially cut out for all Baptized Persons.*'

A single word, appropriately thrown in, is often, in Mr. Noyes's translation, a guide to the explanation of a dark and doubtful saying. We shall not be like to perceive the meaning at once of the fourteenth verse of the Sixty-eighth Psalm, as it stands in the common version. '*When the Almighty scattered kings in it, it was white as snow in Salmon.*' But we shall immediately understand the comparison, by reading,

'When the Most High destroyed the kings in the land,
It was white with their bones like Salmon.'

And equally important is frequently a slight change of collocation. For instance let us take the ninety-eighth verse of the Hundred and Nineteenth Psalm. '*Thou, through thy commandments, hast made me wiser than mine enemies: for they are ever with me.*' We might, in reading this, make the mental inquiry, Who are ever with me, 'thy commandments,' or 'mine enemies'? The collocation might lead us to answer, 'mine enemies.' But this answer would be wrong, and we should not have hesitated at all, if we had read thus;

'Thou hast made me wiser than my enemies by thy precepts;
For they are ever before me.'

We have said much in praise of this new translation, but not more than we think is justly due to it. We have observed some instances in which Mr. Noyes has departed from the common version, where we should have preferred an adherence to it; and one or two more, in which his translation has not seemed to us to convey so probable a meaning as that of some other interpreter. It is very seldom, however, that he has not left a doubtful text plainer than he found it; and for continuity of sense and harmonious flow of sound, his Psalms are to be read throughout with more pleasure and profit than any other translation of them with which we are acquainted. Regarding this volume as intended for popular use, rather than as a critical help to the student, we have noticed it in a corresponding manner. Should Mr. Noyes favor us, as we hope he will, and that soon, with an additional volume of notes, we shall expect to examine his labors more thoroughly.

We do not look to see this or any other translation supersede the one in common use. We regard it as altogether improbable, as almost impossible, that all English Christendom will for a long period to come, if ever again, unite in

adopting the same version of the Scriptures, should that of king James be repudiated. Let the common version, then, remain in our families, in our schools, in our churches. It is a bond of union among us all, of all denominations, the value and strength of which may be greater than we know. But let us understand it; and let us have helps to the understanding or correction of it, that we may read it intelligently as well as reverently. Our apparatus for this purpose need not be cumbersome or expensive. A family will hardly want any other aid, for instance, to the right understanding of the Psalms, than this new translation by Mr. Noyes. Let it be kept by the side of the Family Bible, as the interpreter of a very important portion of it. Let the translator's excellent Preface be carefully read, and then, with the help of the few notes scattered through the book, we know not what will be wanting to the profitable perusal of those divine and ancient songs.

ART. VII. — *The Slavery of the British West India Colonies delineated, as it exists, both in Law and Practice, and compared with the Slavery of other Countries, Ancient and Modern.* By JAMES STEPHEN, Esq. Vol. II. *Being a Delineation of the State in point of Practice.* London. 1830. 8vo. pp. xlv, 452.

WHEN the slave-trade was abolished by Great Britain in 1807, it was confidently expected by the friends of that measure, that it would soon lead to the mitigation and abolition of slavery. In this confidence they remained inactive for a few years. It at length became apparent that no measures of importance for the improvement of the slaves would be voluntarily adopted by the colonial legislatures. New efforts were therefore made by the friends of humanity to call into action the energy of the British government to soften and finally abolish the system of oppression which disgraced the colonies of the empire. Among other means adopted for this purpose was the establishment, we believe about ten years ago, of a Society for mitigating and gradually abolishing Slavery throughout the British Dominions. This society has continued in successful operation ever since its first formation, and has done much to forward the great work

in which it is engaged. In May, 1823, three resolutions were passed by the House of Commons, expressing the expediency of 'adopting effectual and decisive measures for meliorating the condition of the slave population' of the colonies; and by these measures of raising them, at the earliest possible period, to a participation in the civil rights and privileges of other subjects. It was hoped, that the opinion of the House, thus expressed, would induce the colonial legislatures to adopt specific measures for the improvement of their slave population, and thus render the direct interposition of Parliament unnecessary. The exertions of the friends of abolition, though not entirely stopped, were in some degree checked by this slow and cautious policy of the government. Time, however, has completely proved that nothing is to be expected from the West Indian legislatures. The acts which they have passed have all been of the most unsatisfactory character, and obviously intended, not to benefit their slaves, but to delude the imperial government by an apparent compliance with some part of the recommendation in the resolutions.

Hitherto no legislative measure has been adopted by the British government, since the abolition of the African slave-trade, which can have a very powerful influence in mitigating the evils of slavery, except the law forbidding the inter-colonial slave-trade, which was passed a few years ago. In 1829 Orders in Council were passed, by which the free black and colored population of Trinidad, St. Lucia, and the Cape of Good Hope, which are crown colonies,* have been placed on an entire equality in regard to civil and political rights with other British subjects in those places. This measure, it is true, does not directly act upon the condition of the slaves, but, indirectly, its influence will be most important, by removing the prejudices which exist against their color.

In consequence of the obstinate determination which the white inhabitants of the colonies have exhibited not to do

* All our readers may not understand the distinction between the crown, and the chartered colonies. The former are governed entirely by the orders passed by the king in the privy council, having no legislative assemblies; the latter have legislative assemblies, in which their laws are made, which, however, they are obliged to submit to the king for approval or rejection.

any thing for the relief of their oppressed brethren, the friends of emancipation have, for a long time past, been exerting themselves more earnestly than ever to procure the interposition of Parliament. Their exertions have not been unavailing. The subject has been again and again brought before that body. The advocates for the abolition of slavery have been constantly increasing in numbers. The facts and arguments which the 'Anti-Slavery Reporter' and other publications on the same side, have presented to the public, appear to have produced a very deep impression throughout Great Britain, that the situation of the blacks in the colonies demands the instant interposition of the national government for their relief. The general feeling on the subject may be estimated from the following statements of the 'Anti-Slavery Reporter.' It informs us that the public meetings 'for the purpose of petitioning Parliament for the Abolition of Slavery, had been numerous beyond all example.' 'The number of petitions for the Abolition of Slavery presented to the House of Commons from the commencement of the Session in October, 1830, to the Dissolution of Parliament on the twenty-third of April, 1831, was *five thousand four hundred and eighty-four*; — a number far larger, it is believed, than has ever before been presented in one Session on any other subject of public interest.' Many of these petitions, which were adopted at large public meetings, prayed for the immediate abolition of slavery. A petition of this kind was voted at a public meeting in Edinburgh, which was afterwards signed by upwards of twenty-two thousand persons. Resolutions in favor of immediate abolition were also adopted at a public meeting in Liverpool. These proceedings show a remarkable advance in public opinion. A few years ago immediate abolition would have probably been pronounced a rash and hasty measure, by a great majority of those by whom it is now recommended. This change in public sentiment can only be ascribed to the publications which have been made on the subject.

If we are not entirely mistaken in the conclusion to be drawn from the expressions of the general feeling of Great Britain, the time is fast approaching when Parliament will pass laws either for the immediate or the gradual abolition of slavery in the colonies of the empire. A more favorable time could not be chosen for bringing the subject before that

assembly, than the present, when the party which is at the head of the government contains among its members so many who have pledged themselves to the cause of emancipation. Lord Brougham, to specify no others, was, while a member of the House of Commons, its most strenuous advocate. We trust that a regard to his character and his conscience will prevent him from abandoning it, while he is in power.

The publication of the work of Mr. Stephen, named at the head of our article, we consider as most auspicious to the ultimate triumph of the cause of humanity. Before, however, giving an account of the contents of this volume, we shall present our readers with some particulars respecting the author, which we think will be found not devoid of interest. Our information on these points is drawn principally from the Prefaces to the two volumes of his work.

All who have attended to the controversy which has been going on for many years, respecting colonial slavery, have heard of the name of James Stephen. But the nature and extent of his conscientious, long-continued, and devoted exertions for the benefit of the African race, are probably not generally known in this country.

In his Preface to the Second Volume, he narrates the circumstances that prevented him from experiencing the corrupting effects which familiarity with slavery is too apt to produce. In the year 1783 he sailed from England to St. Christopher, in a vessel which touched on the voyage at Barbadoes. At this latter place he attended the trial of four plantation slaves for the murder of a physician. We give the story in his own words.

‘The court, consisting of a bench of justices of the peace, five I think in number, without a jury, was no sooner constituted, than the four black prisoners were placed at the bar; and, as they were the first common field negroes I had seen, their filthy and scanty garbs would have moved my pity, if it had not been more strongly excited by the pain they were visibly suffering from tight ligatures of cord round their crossed wrists, which supplied the place of hand-cuffs. I noticed it to my companion, and said, “Surely they will be put at bodily ease during their trial”; but he replied it was not customary. As there was no indictment, or other express charge, and consequently no arraignment, they had not to hold up their hands;

and remained bound in the same painful way while I remained a spectator.

‘But the first proceeding of the bench changed the sensation of pity in my breast into honest indignation. It was the production and reading by the chairman of a letter received by him from a gentleman, who was owner of two of the prisoners, and who had been written to with an inquiry, whether he would choose to employ a lawyer in the defence of his slaves; and the answer was, that he declined to do so, adding as his reason, “*God forbid that he should wish in such a case to screen the guilty from punishment.*” To the best of my recollection, these were the very words: I am sure such was the exact import of the letter.

‘I turned with a look of astonishment to my conductor; but before I could whisper my feelings, they were diverted from the master to the bench; for to my astonishment the chairman applauded the letter, as honorable to the writer; and the other magistrates concurred in his eulogy.

‘Strangely misplaced though I felt it to be, and shocked though I was at such a cruel prejudication of the unfortunate prisoners by their natural protector, I supposed that the commendation rested on his disinterestedness, in being willing to sacrifice his property in their bodies, without opposition to the demands of public justice; for I did not then know of the laws noticed in my first volume, pp. 322 to 328, which entitle a master, on the conviction and execution of his slave, to be paid for his loss of property out of the public purse. The lawyers’ fees in consequence would have been a profitless expense.

‘Not only was there no written charge, but no opening of the case, on the part of the prosecution. The prisoners had to learn it, as I did, only from the evidence adduced; the uncontroverted part of which was briefly as follows.

‘The deceased had been visiting a certain estate in his usual routine as its medical attendant; and after seeing the patients, mounted his horse, to return to his residence in town. A negro of the estate the same morning brought in the horse with the saddle and bridle on, saying that he had found it grazing in one of the cane pieces; and the manager thereupon ordered it to be put into the stable; but did not send till the next day to give information of the occurrence at the doctor’s house; supposing, as he alleged, that the horse by some accident had got away from him, and would be sent for. The deceased, however, never returned to his home; and, an alarm naturally arising, he was inquired for at the estates he had

visited ; and after consequent searches, the body was found in a cane piece not far from the house he had last visited, with contusions on the head, such as a fall from his horse could not have occasioned, and which were the apparent cause of his death.

‘ So far there was nothing to affect either of the prisoners ; except that one of them, a very old negro, was the man who brought in the horse ; and though this was regarded as a leading circumstance of suspicion against him, it seemed to me of a directly opposite tendency.

‘ But a negro girl, or *wench*, as she was called in the ordinary style of the slave colonies, a deformed creature, apparently about fifteen years old, was next called, as the only witness who could bring the offence home, by positive testimony, to the prisoners.

‘ Before she was examined, she was addressed by the chairman in a way that carried my surprise and indignation to the utmost pitch. She was admonished in the most alarming terms, to beware not to conceal any thing that made against the prisoners ; and told that if she did, she would involve herself in their crime, and its punishment. No caution whatever was given as to any sin or danger on the opposite side. Every word implied a premature conviction in the mind of the court, that the prisoners were certainly guilty, and that she would be probably disbelieved and punished if she said any thing tending to acquit them. Terror was strongly depicted in her countenance during this address ; and I felt at the moment that had I been a jurymen to try the prisoners on her evidence, after such an exhortation, nothing she might testify against them would weigh a feather in my verdict.

‘ As the negro dialect was new to me, I should not have been able clearly to understand her testimony in many parts of it, without the assistance of my companion, who kindly whispered the interpretations that I asked for ; but her story in substance was, that the deceased rode up to the negro houses of a plantation she belonged to, for shelter against a shower of rain ; that he alighted, and gave his horse to one of the prisoners to hold ; and that thereupon he and the other three, the only persons present except herself, fell upon him with sticks, knocked him down, and beat him to death ; and afterwards carried his body to the cane piece in which it was found.

‘ No provocation, or other motive, was assigned by her, and her evidence, independently of the terror that had been impressed upon her, would have appeared to me, from its matter,

and the manner in which it was given, wholly unworthy of credit. The countenances and gesticulations of all the unfortunate men during her examination, impressed me with a strong persuasion of their innocence. Never were the workings of nature more clearly imitated by the most expert actor on any stage, if her whole narrative did not fill them with astonishment; and excite in them all the indignation that belongs to injured innocence. I expressed that feeling strongly to my conductor; and he dissented only by observing that negroes in general were masters of dissimulation; or something to that effect. * * *

‘Here I must cease to narrate the case from my own direct knowledge. But the sequel was well supplied to me by evidence beyond suspicion. The same day I heard of what further passed on the trial, from persons who had staid in court to the end of it. No further evidence had fortified that of the negro *wench* in any material point. On the strength of her testimony alone, the magistrates had convicted all the prisoners of murder.’ — *Preface*, Vol. II. pp. xix — xxiv.

‘I left Barbadoes immediately after the trial, but heard soon after the sequel of the tragedy, from several gentlemen who came from that Island to St. Christopher. The court applied to the Governor, a planter of the Island, and one who afterwards gave a very favorable account of the general humanity of his brethren, before the privy council, for an *exemplary death*; and he ordered that the four convicts should be burnt alive.

‘But what perhaps will be thought the most singular part of the case, remains to be told.

‘The owner of two of the slaves, the same I believe who so *laudably* refused to employ a lawyer for them, on hearing of the evidence on which they had been convicted, in respect of time and place, was able to establish a clear *alibi* in their favor, to the satisfaction of the magistrates who had tried them; in consequence of which they were pardoned. But however incredible it may appear, the two other unfortunate men, convicted on the very same evidence, nevertheless underwent the cruel fate to which they were sentenced. They were literally burnt alive at Bridgetown.’ — pp. xxv, xxvi.

‘Such was the case which gave me my first right views of negro slavery in the sugar colonies, almost as soon as I reached their shores.’ — p. xxvii.

‘The case I have mentioned was every way calculated to rescue me at the outset from delusion. As a lawyer, I could not but be deeply impressed with the shocking contrast it pre-

sented to the impartial and humane administration of British justice, and its reversal of every principle that I had been taught to reverence, by writers on general jurisprudence. And how much were my indignant feelings augmented, when I learned, from an inquiry which it suggested, that white men in the same island were not only exempt from all such barbarous departures from the laws of England; but for the wilful murder of a slave, were liable only to a fine of fifteen pounds.' — p. xxviii.

In consequence of the impression produced by this trial, Mr. Stephen formed a resolution never to own a slave; and during a residence of eleven years at St. Christopher, he, with some inconvenience to himself, strictly adhered to this resolution. During his continuance there, he practised law. In answer to a charge which had been brought against him, by the advocates of slavery, of having been himself the owner of slaves, he says,

'I will be obliged to any reader, ignorant of my history and character, who will take the trouble to inquire of some of the respectable merchants or proprietors now in England, connected with the Leeward Islands, whether I ever held such property; and whether I was not, on the contrary, remarkable for the singularity of carrying my dislike to slavery so far as to have no domestics but hired servants, during the whole of my long residence in St. Christopher. Such was the well known fact. During the chief part of the time I had a family there, which required a pretty numerous domestic establishment, and it was a great breach of economy not to buy my servants; but I was served only by free persons of color, or, when I could not find such of a suitable character, by slaves let out to hire by their owners.

'Nor did I expose the latter to the disadvantages mentioned in this work as belonging to their situation in general. From the first it was my resolution, that such of them as served me long and faithfully, should not remain in slavery; and I acted up to that purpose. I obtained their manumissions, either by paying the whole value, or adding to what they had themselves saved for the purpose, or vindicating by law a right to freedom, which had, in one instance, been unjustly withheld. Not one of them who had served me for any considerable time without misbehavior was left in slavery; except in one instance, which may serve to show the hardships of that state in general. I repeatedly offered to purchase his freedom at his full value; but the owner

would not consent. At length he came from a distant island, at which he resided, to take the man away. To save the poor fellow, not only from slavery, but exile, I intreated the owner to accept his value, to be ascertained by any person of his own nomination, and when this was refused, to name his own price; but he was inexorable; and for no juster reason, but that he knew the man's integrity, and other valuable qualities, and therefore wanted him for his own domestic use. The slave's merits, therefore, and his fitness to make a right use of his freedom, formed, as too frequently happens, the bar to his attainment of it; and his reward was a perpetual exile from the connexions and the island which long settlement in it had endeared to him. In a Spanish or Portuguese colony, he might have compelled the master to enfranchise him by a judicial appraisement.' — *Preface*, Vol. I. pp. liv, lv.

After his return to England, it appears that his zeal for the abolition first of the slave-trade, and afterwards of slavery, was in some degree prejudicial to his private interest.

'Let me not be understood, however, as disclaiming all obligations to my West Indian clients and friends. To such of them as are living, and to many more, alas! whom I shall see no more till all human contentions are ended, I owe what is better than wealth, — great personal kindness, and long continued attachment. Their obliging preference followed me into practice here; and gave me, as a chamber counsel, and a practitioner at the Cockpit, advantages which, in my then circumstances, were of great importance, and were rapidly increasing, till, by taking a public part in the abolition controversy, I willingly renounced them. The greatest of the sacrifices that I have made to the cause I still feebly support, though they have been neither few nor small, was to encounter their displeasure; or rather, as I do many of them the justice to believe, an estrangement from me, which the irresistible impulse of an *esprit de corps* compelled them to, against their real feelings. They knew my sincerity; and could not in their hearts condemn me for maintaining in England, views and principles which I had always avowed and acted upon, often at no small personal risk, while resident among them.' — *Preface*, Vol. I. pp. lvi, lvii.

In 1802 he published a work, which we have never seen, entitled the 'Crisis of the Sugar Colonies,' intended to promote the abolition of the slave-trade. Since that time, he has always been forward and active in all the efforts

which have been made by the opponents of the slave-trade and of slavery. In 1807 he published the 'Dangers of the Country,' and in 1815 'Reasons for establishing a Registry of Slaves,' in relation to a measure which was then proposed. His speeches delivered at two general meetings of the African Institution, on the twenty-sixth of March, 1817, and the sixteenth of May, 1823, have also been published. The publications to which we have referred are all mentioned in the work before us. He has, we believe, also written and published other pieces in behalf of the slaves, which are not particularly referred to, and of which we have no means of preparing a list. He was for some time a member of Parliament, and in that situation faithfully persevered in his efforts in the cause to which he has devoted himself. In 1824 he published the First Volume of his work on 'The Slavery of the British West India Colonies,' in which he gives an accurate and methodical account of the law upon the subject, with much information in regard to the practical operation of the system. The author was engaged upon the work for many years, having begun it, as he informs us, before the abolition of the slave-trade. As this volume has already been spoken of in a former number of our Journal,* as well as in other periodical publications, with well-merited commendation, it is not our intention to take any further notice of it at this time.

The Second Volume, which is named at the head of this article, was, in some respects, a work of greater difficulty than the first. The laws of the colonies being all in print, could not admit of much dispute. We believe that Mr. Stephen's statements in his First Volume, so far as they relate to the law, have generally been admitted to be substantially correct. With regard, however, to the practice of slavery, the case is different. Not only is the practice of one island different from that of another, but that of one person is different from that of others on the same island. To give an account, therefore, of the practice on any single estate, would be far from proving, satisfactorily, the general custom of the island on which it was situated. It is obvious, also, that whatever statements might be made on the subject with regard to any island, might be contradicted by the example of particular estates on

* See Christian Examiner, Vol. IV. No. 3, for May and June, 1827.

the same island ; and that, however cruel the treatment of the negroes in particular instances might appear, the answer was at hand, that the whole system ought not to be condemned on account of the abuses of a few individuals. Besides, to all statements of facts made by the opponents of slavery, the objection would always lie, that they were prejudiced witnesses.

Nearly fifty years ago, the Rev. James Ramsay published '*An Essay on the Treatment and Conversion of African Slaves in the British Sugar Colonies.*' This work was felt by the planters to bear with such severity on their system, that it provoked several replies. From that time to the present, a warm controversy has been raging in Great Britain, as to the actual condition of the slaves, in which a large number of writers, some of them of considerable ability, have taken part. Besides the testimony of these writers on the subject, a vast mass of evidence is contained in the printed Reports of the Committees of the Privy Council and House of Commons on the Slave-trade. These reports were made in reference to the abolition of the slave-trade, and contain the examinations of a great number of witnesses, who gave very various accounts of the condition of the negroes in the colonies. The advocates of slavery have commonly represented the general treatment of the slaves as being mild and humane ; its opponents, on the contrary, have declared that the slaves were usually over-worked and under-fed, and subjected to cruel punishments. To one who has not been accustomed, in weighing evidence, to make great allowances for the effects of interest, prejudice, passion, and mistake, the testimony on the two sides appears entirely irreconcilable. We do not undertake to say, that a careful scrutiny of the whole evidence, might not lead a disinterested inquirer to the truth upon most points. But the labor of extracting truth from a comparison of such a mass of contradictory statements, would have been immense, and it would not have been easy to present the arguments and conclusions in a shape which would be entirely satisfactory to general readers.

Viewing these difficulties, Mr. Stephen has constructed his work upon a singular plan, by which he has completely avoided them. He undertakes to establish every fact which he states, and which is denied on the part of the colonies, by the evidence of their own assemblies, witnesses, and partizans.

‘There cannot be more satisfactory evidence than the admissions of an adversary’s witnesses, especially when they stand also in the situation of parties accused, and when the admitted facts make against themselves, as well as against the cause they defend. — When there has been a previous clashing of testimony between the parties, and the question turns upon the comparative credit due to opposite witnesses, such admissions are peculiarly valuable, and conclusive. Hence, what seemed to be highly adverse to the cause of truth in the Slave-trade controversy, will perhaps be found to befriend it; for the witnesses produced on the side of the colonies were, for the most part, not only zealous partizans of the system they described, but interested, both by fortune and character, in its defence.

‘The evidence to which I shall chiefly resort, that which was taken in the course of inquiries on the subject, by Parliament and the executive government, consists chiefly of accounts given by persons of this description; and of a species of evidence, which, when it tends to condemn the colonial system, is, if possible, still more conclusive; the answers solemnly given by the West India legislatures, and their public agents, to questions proposed by the Privy Council. What faith was due to such testimony, when it went to contradict the charges of abolitionists, or the testimony adduced by them, I shall not here stop to inquire; — its authority on that side will be better estimated, when we have seen a little of its particular style and character. But this may be safely affirmed, that better evidence cannot be had or desired, as to the facts that were in issue between the abolitionists and the colonial party, when its obvious effect was to substantiate the charges of the former; or to disprove the defence set up on the part of the latter.

‘It is on such evidence that I shall chiefly rely; nor shall I assume the truth of any statement adverse to the colonial system that has ever been controverted, however unimpeachable the testimony may be on which it stands, until I have shown it to have been directly or indirectly confirmed by the same decisive evidence, the concessions of the colonists themselves.’ — Vol. i. pp. 10, 11.

To the plan which Mr. Stephen thus proposes, he has carefully adhered in both volumes. He has been enabled, by means of it, to present a work to the public which carries to every unprejudiced mind a thorough conviction of its truth. No work, we have good reason to believe, ever published in England against slavery, has produced so deep an impression. It has inspired the friends of the abolition of slavery with hope and

confidence that the terrible system, which it exposes, cannot long be permitted to exist; and it has spread dismay among the supporters of colonial oppression, — a dismay which is only rendered more apparent by their feeble and ineffectual efforts to answer it.

The Second Volume, which alone it is our present intention to examine particularly, is remarkable as a specimen of moral reasoning. As the defenders of slavery, of course, have not, in most instances, made direct avowals of the full evils of the system, Mr. Stephen has often to point out the necessary, though not, at first view, apparent conclusions, to be drawn from the concessions which they make. Sometimes he shows that all the material facts in dispute are admitted by his opponents, though discolored and distorted by party feeling. Sometimes he compares the testimony of several persons, and extracts from them a truth which they were all desirous to conceal. Sometimes he demolishes the positions of an adversary, by showing his inconsistency with himself, and sometimes by adducing the opposing statements of others on the same side. He avails himself, with great judgment, of those unintentional intimations of the truth, which sometimes escape from the most thorough partisans, and, when they are pointed out, are more satisfactory to an inquirer than the most direct testimony. In short, he has neglected no means, by which truth could be extorted from reluctant witnesses. An adequate conception of the masterly skill with which he has performed his arduous undertaking, can scarcely be gained without going through the book. The conviction of the truth of his conclusions, is impressed on the reader with an irresistible force, like that which one receives from the *Horæ Paulinæ*. The reader is not only satisfied that the arguments are sound, but perceives that they do not admit of an answer.

Mr. Stephen in this volume gives an account of the treatment of the 'predial slaves, commonly called *field negroes*,' in the British sugar colonies.

We purpose to give a sketch of this part of his work, which we believe will be generally interesting, from its exhibiting a state of society that is not well understood among us, upon an authority which may be trusted with entire confidence, for he makes no assertion which is not abundantly supported by the concessions of his opponents.

The plan and object of Mr. Stephen, as stated by himself, are as follows.

‘In delineating the ordinary exercise of these powers, I shall confine myself to the treatment of the predial slaves, commonly called the “*field negroes*”; not only because these form by far the most numerous class, amounting, probably, to four-fifths of the whole enslaved population, but because it is upon them, that the slavery of the sugar colonies falls with the heaviest and most destructive pressure. *Domestics*, are likely to suffer more from the anger, the revenge, the suspicion, and other malevolent feelings of the master; with whom they are brought, much oftener than the field negroes, into personal contact and collision; but his avarice, that far wider and surer source of oppression, is opposed to the comfort, the health, and often the existence, of the predial slaves. They are on sugar plantations, as I shall show, universally over-worked, and for the most part under-fed, not because the proprietor is cruel, nor always because he is too greedy of gain, but because most proprietors are necessitous; and because all, having acquired their estates after progressive competition had pushed the exaction of forced labor to its present extent, they cannot, without great sacrifice of present income, or the protection of a general law, reduce it to such bounds as would consist with the physical or moral well-being, or generally even with the preservation, of the slaves. I do not, therefore, mean to describe or notice, unless incidentally and by way of illustration, any of the oppressions under which they suffer, except those which I hold, and have ever held, to be the most cruel and destructive, as well as the most general and inherent to the system, excess of labor, and insufficiency of maintenance; in other words, those abuses of the master’s power which arise from his selfish, not his malevolent feelings.

‘Incidental, however, to these main topics, and inseparably connected with a fair consideration of them, is the discipline by which labor is coerced; the harsh and brutalizing nature of which greatly aggravates the ill effects of its excess, and constitutes, at the same time, a third head of oppression, not less general than the two former, and springing from the same ordinary motives.

‘My practical delineation, then, will be much narrower in its plan, though not, I fear, in its bulk, than my account of the Slave Laws; and shall be arranged as follows:—

‘1. I will state and consider the forced labor imposed on the slaves of sugar plantations in its ordinary nature and amount; premising some remarks on human labor in the Torrid Zone in

general, and subjoining a comparative view of agricultural labor in England.

‘2. I will describe the means of coercion and discipline by which their labor is enforced.

‘3. I will state the ordinary treatment of the slaves in respect of food, clothing, and other necessities provided by the master.’

— Vol. II. pp. 42, 43.

Without considering his preliminary remarks, in which he shows, most satisfactorily, that nature never intended that man should work so much in the torrid zone, as in more temperate climates, and that he can endure more labor in temperate climates without exhaustion, we pass to the labor actually done by the slaves in the sugar colonies. This, Mr. Stephen shows to be cruelly excessive, both in amount and degree. Before stating the evidence on this point, he has a chapter, in which, with great force of argument, he demonstrates ‘the high probability, that the amount of forced labor on sugar plantations, is oppressively and destructively excessive, deduced from the natural tendency of the system; and confirmed by the decline of population among the predial slaves.’

The constant progressive decline of the slave population in the British sugar colonies, is so notorious, that it is scarcely necessary to add any extracts on that subject, but we shall give a single statement, made by Mr. Stephen, which is truly startling. He says, that in ‘the last six years,’ referring, we presume, to all the sugar colonies ‘comprised in the official returns laid before Parliament, viz., from 1813 to 1824, the loss amounted to three per cent.’ He adds, in a note,

‘The waste of life is evidently in a larger proportion, by all the amount of that increase which should have been made by births, within the same period; and estimating this only by the rate of increase in the slaves of the United States, the loss in six years may be said to be more than 18 per cent., or 3 per cent. per annum, amounting in number to 145,331.’ — p. 77, *note*.

Mr. Stephen next considers the facts as to the amount of labor done by slaves. He states and demonstrates, that the slaves, during crop-time, work eighteen hours and more in a day, and at least sixteen on an average during the year. The mode of this labor is thus described by Mr. Ramsay, in a passage cited by Mr. Stephen. We should observe, that Mr. Ramsay, being an anti-slavery writer, is not adduced as evi-

dence by Mr. Stephen, but only as giving a clear statement of the case, which Mr. Stephen afterwards proves by many concessions on the part of his adversaries. Similar remarks might be made as to other extracts from Mr. Stephen, which we shall make hereafter. It is obvious, that to insert the argumentative part of the work, by which the statements are proved, would be impossible, without extending our extracts to a very inconvenient length.

“The discipline of a sugar estate,” says the writer, “is as exact as that of a regiment. At four o’clock in the morning, the plantation bell rings to call the slaves into the field. Their work is to manure, dig, and hoe-plow the ground, to plant, weed, and cut the canes, and bring them to the mill, &c. About nine o’clock they have half an hour for breakfast, which they take in the field. — Again they fall to work; and, according to the custom of the plantation, continue until eleven o’clock or noon. The bell then rings; and the slaves are dispersed in the neighbourhood to pick up, about the fences, in the mountains and fallows, or waste grounds, natural grass and weeds for the horses and cattle. The time allotted for this branch of work and preparation of dinner, varies from an hour and a half to near three hours. In collecting pile by pile their little bundles of grass, the slaves of lowland plantations, frequently burnt up by the sun, must wander in their neighbour’s grounds perhaps more than two miles from home.”

‘After noticing some occasional hardships, to which the poor slave is exposed, by being punished as a trespasser, and having his bundle of grass taken away from him, after its painful collection, he adds, “At one, or in some plantations at two o’clock, the bell summons them to deliver in the tale of their grass, and assemble to their field-work. If the owner thinks their bundles too small, or if they come too late with them, they are punished with a number of stripes, from four to ten; some masters, under a fit of carefulness for their cattle, have gone as far as fifty stripes. About half an hour before sun-set, they may be found scattered again over the land, to cull again, blade by blade, from among the weeds, their scanty parcels of grass. About seven o’clock in the evening, or later according to the season of the year, when the overseer can find leisure, they are called over by list to deliver in their second bundles of grass; and the same punishment as at noon is inflicted on the delinquents. They then separate, to pick up, in their way to their huts, (if they have not done it, as they generally do, while gathering grass,) a little brushwood, or cow-dung, to prepare some simple mess for supper and to-

morrow's breakfast. This employs them till near midnight; and then they go to sleep till the bell calls them in the morning."

"The work here mentioned," continues Mr. Ramsay, "is considered as the duty of slaves that may be insisted on, without reproach to the manager of unusual severity; and which the white and black overseers stand over them to see executed; the transgression of which is quickly followed with the smart of the cart-whip. In crop-time, which, he observes, may be reckoned together on a plantation from five to six months, the cane-tops, by supplying the cattle with food, give the slaves some little relaxation in picking grass; but some planters will, especially in moon-light keep their slaves till ten o'clock at night, in carrying wowra (the decayed leaves of the cane) to boil off the cane juice; a considerable number of slaves are kept to attend, in turn, the mill and boiling-house all night.

"The process of sugar-making is carried on in many plantations for months, without any other interruption than during some part of day-light on Sundays. In some plantations, it is the custom to keep the whole gang employed, as above, from morning to night, and alternately one half throughout the night, to supply the mill with canes, and the boiling-house with wowra."

"He admits that there are mitigations of this treatment among the more humane and liberal planters; and adds, "In some particular plantations they enjoy as much ease and indulgence, the grievance of picking grass, *and the circumstance of their being so long as sixteen hours out of the twenty-four under the lash of the drivers, excepted*, as are compatible with their present state of ignorance and dependence, and the accurate methodical cultivation of a sugar estate." — pp. 86 — 88.

It is proper that we should give Mr. Stephen's note on this passage.

"In undertaking to prove the truth of this account, I do not mean that it is accurate in every particular; or that it was so generally, in the sense that Mr. R.'s enemies ascribed to it; but only in his own. He meant to describe the practice as he had known it in St. Christopher, or in that island and Nevis alone; as clearly appears from the work itself. In Jamaica, and some other sugar colonies, the subjects, modes, and times of labor, are, and always have been, variant in some respects from those of the old colonies, which then formed the Leeward-island government; and I shall fully notice those varieties hereafter. The reverend author also admitted, as we have seen, that there was

less severity of treatment on some plantations in the same islands, than on others. He meant his account to be considered, therefore, as generally, not universally, true.

‘ But I would direct the attention of my readers to the last extract, which I have printed in italics, as descriptive of the ordinary amount of daily labor, even on those estates which he notices as favorable exceptions. That this was not, and still is not, less than sixteen hours in the twenty-four, on an average, I trust clearly to establish in respect of the sugar-colonies at large ; and, if this proposition is proved, it ought to be more than enough for my purpose.’ — pp. 88, 89, *note*.

After demonstrating how excessive the labor of the field slaves is, in point of duration, Mr. Stephen next shows how excessive it is in point of intensity. The process of holing is thus described.

“ Holing ” is the process of preparing land for the reception of the cane plants ; for which purpose it is laid out in rectilinear trenches of considerable depth, which are divided into equal sections of about two feet square, and the work is wholly performed by the hoe. Its difficulty consists chiefly in the hard texture of the soil, trodden down in the labors of the preceding crop, and baked by the heat of a tropical sun during about nine months of an intervening fallow. The surface is quite impenetrable by the spade, and equals, in hardness, those soils to which our laborers apply the pick-axe. The hoe, therefore, for effectual penetration, must be raised above the workman’s head, and brought down with a vigorous stroke ; and it will be found, that almost every colonial witness, or writer, who ascribes easiness to plantation labors in general, admits this large branch of them to be severe.’ — pp. 164, 165.

Mr. Stephen gives an account of various other labors in which the slaves are employed, some of which, especially those of cutting the canes, and feeding the fires in the mills, for making sugar, appear to be extremely severe from the rapidity with which the motions are performed.

In the sixth chapter of his work, Mr. Stephen compares the amount of the labor of slaves, on sugar plantations, with that of agricultural laborers in England. To this comparison he was led by the bold assertions which have been often made by the planters and their advocates, that the labor of the negro slave was much less than that of laborers in Great Britain. The result of this comparison we give in his own words ;

‘ Let me proceed, then, to take up this gage, thrown down by almost all my antagonists, and to state what are the ordinary portions of working-time, which the best wages obtain from the ablest agricultural laborers in England. * * *

“ The time which the day-laborers in husbandry usually continue at their work, may, on an average throughout the year, be estimated at nine hours per diem.”

“ From Michaelmas to Christmas, making allowance for the different lengths of the days, they come to their work, one day with another, at seven in the morning, and leave it at five in the afternoon. Deducting two hours and a half for meals, going, and coming, there will remain seven hours and a half of clear labor. The same estimate may be made for the following quarter. From Lady-day to Midsummer, they come to their work at six o’clock, and leave it at the same hour in the evening ; but as the season is warmer, they are a longer time absent from their work (about three hours,) which will leave nine hours for work. In the other quarter, as the hay-season and the harvest comprehend the greater part of it, their wages are considerably higher, and more work is done ; and it may fairly be estimated, that from Midsummer to Michaelmas, a laborer, after all deductions for meals, going and coming, and every other cause of absence, is twelve hours at his work, one day with another. The average hours of work, in these several portions of the year, will amount to nine hours per diem, viz.

	Hours per diem.
Michaelmas to Christmas, . . .	$7\frac{1}{2}$
Christmas to Lady-day, . . .	$7\frac{1}{2}$
Lady-day to Midsummer, . . .	9
Midsummer to Michaelmas, . . .	12
	—
	36 — which,

divided by four, gives an average of nine hours.”

‘ What, then, are the comparative results ? They are, that the time of the slave-labor, to the time of the free-labor, is, on an average of the whole year, as sixteen, at least, to nine ; that the minimum of the former, much exceeds the maximum of the latter ; that in the crop-season of five months’ duration, the West India slave has but one half, at most, of the diurnal respite which the English laborer enjoys, even in the laborious harvest quarter, viz. six hours, (not to say five only,) instead of twelve.

The next chapter gives an account of the means by which labor is enforced on sugar plantations, which, as the author

truly remarks, greatly aggravate its severity, and are, in their nature and effects, extremely cruel and pernicious. The following is an account of the driving system, which he extracts from his own publication, 'The Crisis of the Sugar Colonies.'

"Every man who has heard any thing of West India affairs, is acquainted with the term *negro-drivers*, and knows, or may know, that the slaves, in their ordinary field-labor, are driven to their work, and during their work, in the strict sense of the term *driven*, as used in Europe; though this statement no more implies that the lash is incessantly, or with any needless frequency, applied to their backs, than the phrase to drive a team of horses imports, that the wagoner is continually smacking his whip." "It is enough for my purpose, that in point of fact no feature of West India slavery is better known, or less liable to controversy, or doubt, than this established method in which field-labor is enforced." (So I certainly thought when penning those paragraphs for the public. I had not then sufficiently learnt of what temerity, in assertion, my opponents were capable, when their bad cause required it.) "But a nearer and more particular view of this leading characteristic may be necessary to those who have never seen a gang of negroes at their work."

"When employed in the labor of the field, as for example, in holing a cane-piece, i. e. in turning up the ground into parallel trenches for the reception of the cane-plants, the slaves of both sexes, from twenty perhaps to fourscore in number, are drawn out in a line, like troops on a parade, each with a hoe in his or her hand; and, close to them, in the rear, is stationed a driver, or drivers, in number duly proportioned to that of the gang. Each of the drivers, who are always the most vigorous and active negroes on the estate, has in his hand, or coiled round his neck, from which, by extending the handle, it can be disengaged in a moment, a long, thick, and strongly-plaited whip, called a cart-whip; the report of which is as loud, and the lash as severe, as those of the whips in common use with our wagoners; and which he has authority to apply at the instant when his eye perceives an occasion, without any previous warning. Thus disposed, their work begins, and continues without interruption for a certain number of hours, during which, at the peril of the drivers, an adequate portion of the land must be holed."

"As the trenches are generally rectilinear, and the whole line of holers advances together, it is necessary that every hole or section of the trench should be finished in equal time with the rest; and if any one or more negroes were allowed to throw the hoe with less rapidity or energy than their companions in other parts of the line, it is obvious that the work of the latter

must be suspended, or else such part of the trench as is passed over by the former will be more imperfectly formed than the rest. It is, therefore, the business of the drivers, not only to urge forward the whole gang with sufficient speed, but sedulously to watch that all in the line, whether male or female, old or young, strong or feeble, work as nearly as possible in equal time, and with equal effect. The tardy stroke must be quickened, and the languid invigorated, and the whole line made to *dress*, in the military phrase, as it advances. No breathing-time, no resting on the hoe, no pause of languor, to be repaid by brisker exertion on return to work, can be allowed to individuals. All must work or pause together."

"I have taken this work," it was added, "as the strongest example; but other labors of the plantation are conducted on the same principle, and as nearly as may be practicable, in the same manner. When the nature of the work does not admit of the slaves being drawn up in line abreast, they are disposed, when the measure is feasible, in some other regular order, for the facility of the driver's superintendence and coercion. In carrying the canes, for instance, from the field to the mill, they are marched in files, each with a bundle on his head, and with the driver in the rear. His voice quickens their pace, and his whip, when necessary, urges on those who attempt to deviate, or loiter on their march." — pp. 193 — 195.

Of the effects of this cruel system of driving, though they are fully pointed out by Mr. Stephen, we have left ourselves no room to speak. He gives it as his opinion, that the only remedy for the mischiefs produced by the driving system, compatible with forced labor, is individual task-work.

The proposition maintained in the eighth chapter is, that 'the maintenance of slaves is in a very oppressive and cruel degree parsimonious.' This proposition is established in an unanswerable manner. The extent to which the oppression is carried is almost incredible, and we must regret that the limits of our work will not permit us to extract the details upon the subject which are presented by Mr. Stephen. To show the insufficiency of food, we shall only offer a single extract from a law of the Leeward Islands regulating the weekly allowance of food to slaves. The allowance, which is represented by the legislative body that enacted it, to be 'humane and liberal,' is as follows.

"Nine pints of corn or beans per week, or eight pints of pease, or wheat or rye flour, or Indian corn meal, or nine pints

of oatmeal, or seven pints of rice, or eight pounds of biscuit." Certain weights of native provisions, not as additions, but further alternatives, were also prescribed; and with them, or with either of these rations, one pound and a quarter of herrings, shads, mackerel, or other salted provisions, per week; and the act allowed a reduction of one-fifth part of these scanty allowances in crop-time; i. e. during five months of the twelve.' — p. 289.

The insufficiency of this allowance, which must indeed be obvious to any one who examines the subject, is very evident on comparing it with allowances in other cases.

'The last Consolidation Act of Jamaica, that of December, 1816, clause 69, furnishes an express standard of sufficiency in the case of slaves confined in the workhouses and gaols of that island. The keepers are required to give to every slave in their custody, "*a sufficient quantity of good and wholesome provisions daily; that is to say, not less than one quart of unground Guinea or Indian corn, or three pints of the flour or meal of either, or three pints of wheat flour, or certain specified commutations in other vegetable articles, with one herring or shad.*"

'What clearer or more authoritative condemnation of the masters in the foreign-fed colonies, and their law-givers too, can be desired? Their allowances of food to hard-working negroes, even if the general practice conformed to the meliorating law, would be less by about one-half, than the quantities here prescribed as the minimum of adequate support to the same people when in gaol. That the council and assembly of Jamaica were highly competent judges on the subject will not be denied; nor will it be supposed that their estimate of sufficiency was purposely excessive. They could not mean to encourage desertion and other offences, and aggravate needlessly the public expense, by a superfluous liberality in the rations. Yet if these are not more than sufficient, the slaves in the Leeward Islands must be half starved; and would be so, even were their allowances increased in the degree that Dr. Collins ventured to recommend. He advised that they should be raised to ten or twelve pints weekly, when the slaves depended wholly upon them; but even this, if the Jamaica estimate be right, would be from seven to nine pints less than enough. Had that writer possessed the power of legislation, he would, I doubt not, have thought the same.

'Let us next look at the practice of slave-masters in the United States of North America. For this, I may consistently quote anti-slavery authority, for it respects not our own colo-

nies, but is a statement of the Manumission Society of New York, which certainly had no wish to magnify the liberality of American slave-masters. "The planters of South Carolina allow to each slave per week a peck of Indian corn, five pounds of bacon, and a pint of molasses; but in the upper country, where provisions are more abundant, the few slaves there fare nearly as well as their masters. They are neither tasked in work, nor limited in their provisions." — pp. 320, 321.

An extract from Dr. Collins, an advocate of slavery, will perhaps place this matter in a clearer light.

'In reasoning anxiously,' says Mr. Stephen, 'to persuade his brother planters of the West Indies at large, to be more liberal in their allowances of food, he urges their own self-interest, in "the greater labor which a well-fed negro is capable of executing, in proportion to one who is half-starved, and in his exemption from disease, and its possible consequence, death; for I avow it boldly," he adds, "*melancholy experience having given me occasion to make the remark, that a great number of negroes have perished annually by diseases produced by inanition.* To be convinced of this truth, let us trace the effect of that system which assigned for a negro's weekly allowance six or seven pints of flour or grain, with as many salt herrings, and it is in vain to conceal, what we all know to be true, that in many of the islands they did not give more.

"With so scanty a pittance it is indeed possible for the soul and body to be held together for a considerable portion of time, provided a man's only business be to live, and his spirits be husbanded with a frugal hand; but if motion short of labor, much more labor itself, and that too intense, be exacted from him, how is the body to support itself? What is there to thicken and enrich the fluids — what to strengthen the solids, to give energy to the heart, and to invigorate its pulsations? Your negroes may crawl about with feeble, emaciated frames; but they will never possess, under such a regimen, that vigor of mind and tone of muscles which the service of the plantation demands. Their attempts to wield the hoe prove abortive; they shrink from their toil; and, being urged to perseverance by stripes, you are soon obliged to receive them into the hospital; whence, unless your plan be speedily corrected, they depart but to the grave." — p. 258.

The clothing for the slaves in the islands appears to be shamefully insufficient.

'It appears from them [the answers of West India witnesses]

that the proprietors, with the exception of some who are too indigent or penurious to have regular yearly supplies of clothing from this country, distribute to their slaves one suit per annum, or else the materials for making it; in general only the latter; and that it consists of the following articles:—To the men, a short jacket of coarse and flimsy woollen, called *baize* or *bamboo*, and breeches or trowsers of Osnaburg, or other coarse linen; and sometimes, not always, a coarse worsted cap or hat. To the women, a short jacket or wrapper, and a petticoat of the same linen, and a like quantity of the *baize* or *bamboo* for a jacket.' — pp. 343, 344.

In the tenth chapter, it is proved that the slaves are very badly lodged. We have only room for the following extract on this point.

'That men who are thus inadequately fed and clothed, are not less penuriously dealt with in other respects, may be easily believed. That they are better *lodged*, however, might, perhaps, be surmised; because, it is admitted, on all hands, that their huts are, for the most part, built by themselves; and I could cite many inviting accounts, given by their masters, both of their houses and furniture, in which, with the usual craft of my opponents, they ascribe to the poor field-negroes in general, what is partially true, only, of the drivers and other head men.

'But here, again, Dr. Collins is an instructive guide; "Our dwellings," he says, "are inaccessible both to rain and wind. But the huts of negroes, which imperfectly possess the former advantage, are totally destitute of the latter; every agitation of the air being felt in them, and that with an effect proportioned to the state of the body when exposed to its current." This, too, he considers as a frequent cause of sickness; and exhorts their masters to assist them in building better habitations. As to furniture, he says, "It is proper to give them something to sleep upon, that they may be kept from the ground. At present, a board is sometimes given to them for that purpose, and sometimes not. Instead of it, I would recommend a bedstead, composed of boards six feet four inches long, and three or four wide, planed on one side, and supported at the distance of eighteen inches from the ground," &c.

'Here, as usual, he feared to alarm the rigid economy of the masters; and therefore added, "Of these bedsteads, an indifferent plantation carpenter will make three in a day, and the cost of each, in boards, nails, and labor, will not be more than ten or twelve shillings." "The negroes," he further observes, "are accustomed to hard lodgings; yet, to render them more comfort-

able, and to prevent the flesh being annoyed in the conflict between the bones and the boards, they may be covered with banana mats, preferably to pads made with the leaves."

'Such is the lodging, which, like the food and labor, so many respectable witnesses pronounced to be proper, liberal, and superior to that of the peasantry, or the lower class of people of every description, in this country. A hut that is weather-proof, and a board, with a coarse mat, to receive the negro's weary limbs by night, are recommended as important improvements; though here, to say of a poor man, that "*he has not a bed to lie upon*," is thought a very moving image of distress.

'In this particular, the errors of strangers, or transient guests, in their accounts of the West Indies, may be easily produced by what I have reason to believe is a very ordinary imposition. If, on visiting a planter, they show any curiosity to see the huts of the slaves, commonly called the negro-houses, they are conducted by their entertainer to two or three in the group, which are the habitations of the drivers, carpenters, masons, or other tradesmen, the chiefs of the gang, whose many comparative advantages I have frequently noticed; and in these, though on a cursory outside view not very distinguishable from the other negro huts, the strangers may find appearances of humble comfort, both as to the dwelling and its furniture; which they are naturally led to regard as fair examples of the general case; though the hut of the common drudges, which it would be rudely prying to enter, would excite only compassion and disgust.' — pp. 359, 360.

In the eleventh chapter, it is proved that the slaves 'are treated with great harshness, neglect, and inhumanity, when sick.' We shall not enter into the details of this melancholy subject, but must content ourselves with remarking, that the proposition advanced by the author is established beyond question.

The last chapter of the work consists of 'concluding and practical reflections,' from which we extract the following eloquent passage.

'Am I asked what are my practical conclusions, from the shocking and opprobrious facts established in this and my former volume? What can they be, but one, — that the effectual interposition of Parliament should not a moment longer be delayed?

'Enough was known before; more than enough was incontrovertibly proved; nay, enough was always admitted or undenied; to make the legislative toleration of this slavery a disgrace to the British and Christian name. Iniquity, indeed, of every

kind, loses in human detestation, what it gains in mischief, by wide, unreprieved diffusion, and by age. We sin remorselessly, because our fathers sinned, and because multitudes of our own generation sin, in the same way without discredit. But if ever those most flagitious crimes of Europe, slave-trade and colonial slavery, shall cease to be tolerated by human laws, and live in history alone, men will look back upon them with the horror they deserve; and wonder as much at the depravity of the age that could establish or maintain them, as we now do at the murderous rites of our pagan ancestors, or the ferocious cannibal manners of New Zealand.

‘There is enough in the simplest conception of personal hereditary slavery, to revolt every just and liberal mind, independently of all aggravations to be found in its particular origin, or in abuses of the master’s powers. But how much should sympathy and indignation be enhanced, when the cruel perpetual privation of freedom, and of almost every civil and human right, is the punishment of no crime, nor the harsh consequence of public hostility in war, but imposed upon the innocent and helpless, by the hand of rapacious violence alone; and maintained for no other object but the sordid one of the master’s profit, by the excessive labor to which they are compelled?’

‘Were our merchants to send agents to buy captives from the bandits in the forests of Italy, or from the pirates on the Barbary coast, and sell them here as slaves, to work for our farmers or manufacturers; and were the purchasers to claim, in consequence, a right to hold these victims of rapine and avarice, with their children, in bondage for ever, and to take their work, without wages; what would it be but the same identical case we are contemplating, except that the captives were of a different complexion? Yet the bandits and pirates are hanged; and their vendees, in the case supposed, would have less to apprehend from actions or indictments for false imprisonment, than from the vengeance of indignant multitudes. It certainly, at least, would not be necessary, for the purpose of their deliverance, to prove to the British Parliament, or people, that the poor captives were overworked, under-fed, driven with whips to their work, punished in a brutal way for every real or imputed fault, and, by such complicated oppressions, brought in great numbers prematurely to their graves.

‘But an advocate of the unfortunate negroes, in the present day, has to address himself to many who have so far surrendered their judgment to colonial imposture, and their moral feelings to colonial influence and example, as almost to doubt whether personal slavery is an evil, or its unjust imposition a crime. It

was not, therefore, without necessity, that I have torn from that social monster the screen which distance and falsehood had cast before him; and exhibited him to the eyes of the British people in his true and hideous forms.

‘Having now performed that painful and invidious task; having shown, by decisive evidence, what the slavery of the sugar colonies really is, both in law and practice; I will not waste the time of my readers, by offering any arguments in proof, that such a state should no longer be suffered to exist. It would, indeed, be worse than idle; it would be insulting their understandings and their hearts to do so. It would be supposing in them a perfect insensibility to every moral obligation. That personal slavery should find apologists and patrons among the people of England, is strange, and opprobrious enough; especially at the present day, when we hail with enthusiasm the march of civil liberty in every foreign land, and are scarcely satisfied with its perfection in our own; but, if our love of freedom be thus grossly inconsistent, I trust our national humanity will be more impartial; and that, though many among us, who profess to detest slavery, civil or personal, in Greece and Spain, and Portugal and Algiers, have defended its far heavier yoke in the sugar colonies, — all who are not principals, or accomplices, in the cruel and murderous oppressions which I have here delineated, will view them with abhorrence. I will anticipate, then, no dissent, by any disinterested reader, from my conclusion, that this most odious system ought to exist no more.’ — pp. 387 — 389.

Having said so much of the condition of the slaves in the West Indies, we are naturally led to inquire what is the situation of the same class of our own population. Into this inquiry, however, we shall not enter at this time, not because we do not consider it a proper subject of discussion in the Northern States, but because we have already gone beyond our usual limits, and because our information on the subject is not so full and satisfactory as we could desire.

It is but justice, however, to say, that we have good reason to believe, that the usual treatment of slaves, in this country, is, in some particulars, more mild and humane than in the British West Indies. This seems to be established by the single fact, that the natural increase of the slaves in this country is nearly, if not quite, as rapid as that of the whites,* while in the British sugar islands, they are constantly diminishing.

* This, of course, must be understood of the whole United States. In the slave-holding States, the slaves, on the whole, have increased more

We are inclined to believe, that slaves are not so much overworked in this country as they are in the West Indies. The driving system, which is universal in all the sugar colonies, is not so general in this country, but a system of task-work is established in its place.

The causes, which have produced a better treatment of slaves in this country, are sufficiently obvious. We can only allude to them. The most important, probably is, that the disproportion of numbers between the slaves and the whites, is in no part of our country so great, as it is between the same classes in the West Indies. Taking all the British slave colonies together, there are nearly eight times as many slaves as whites, and a free black and colored population considerably exceeding the whites. In some of the islands, there are ten times as many slaves as whites; and in others, the slaves exceed the whites even in a greater proportion. In this country, on the other hand, the slaves are more numerous than the whites only in two States, South Carolina and Louisiana, and in those, only in a very small proportion; while all the slave-holding States together contain nearly twice as many free persons as slaves.

Another reason, why slavery is not quite so severe in this country as in the British colonies, is, that here food is probably cheaper, and more abundant, than it is in the West Indies.

Besides this, the cultivation of sugar, in which it is admitted that the labors of the slave are more severe and exhausting than in any other, has been but little pursued in this country, compared with the West Indies.

One of the chief causes of the extreme ill-treatment of slaves in the West Indies, is the general non-residence of the owners

rapidly than the whites. We cannot, however, say, with certainty, that the natural increase of the slaves, in that section, is greater than that of the whites, on account of the emigration of the whites into the non-slave-holding States, and other causes.

Whether the natural increase of the slaves be not quite as rapid as that of the free population of our country, it is difficult to determine. A mere comparison of the censuses will not lead to any satisfactory conclusion, for various elements must be brought into any calculation on the subject, whose value it is not easy to ascertain. These are, the increase of the free population of the United States, by voluntary immigration; the increase of the slave population, before 1808, by new importations; the diminution of the slave population, by enfranchisement; and the diminution of the free people of color, by emigration.

of estates. The great majority of these proprietors reside in Great Britain, and large numbers of them never visit the islands from which they draw their revenues. The consequences to the poor slaves, who are thus left in the hands of men, whose interest in their good treatment and comfort is not very direct and obvious, whose morals are low, and education imperfect, are, as might be expected, very melancholy. In this country, on the contrary, we believe that the entire non-residence of planters on their estates, is very rare. That the slaves must usually be benefited by the personal supervision of their owners, can scarcely be questioned.

Another circumstance, which, no doubt, has a favorable influence on the condition of the slaves in this country, is the contiguity of the slave-holding States to those in which slavery is prohibited. The opinions upon the law and practice of slavery, which are generally entertained, and in some degree expressed in the Northern States, we believe, tend to diminish the evils of the system. Though the expression of these opinions sometimes excites violent bursts of indignation at the South, yet they are not the less certainly producing changes in sentiment among slave-holders. It can hardly be questioned, that slavery, as it exists, in law and practice, in Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky, which join upon the non-slave-holding States, and are therefore more readily influenced by their habits and opinions, is milder than it is in the more southerly States.

Having thus conceded, as justice demanded, that slavery in this country is less severe than it is in the British colonies, we trust that our concession will not be thought to extend to any approbation of the system, as it exists here, or of any system of slavery whatever.

It is not our intention, at present, to consider the modes in which the great work of enfranchisement, which is sooner or later to take place in the Southern States, ought to be attempted by their legislative assemblies. But nothing, we believe, would do more to promote this good cause, than a work similar in plan to Mr. Stephen's Second Volume, giving a plain account of the practice of slavery in regard to the time and mode of labor in the cultivation of the principal staples, as of cotton, tobacco, rice, and sugar; the manner in which labor is enforced; the situation of the slaves in regard to food, clothing, lodging, and treatment in sickness, and the varieties of practice in all these particulars, in different parts of the country. We are

aware, that the work which we suggest is one of great labor, and scarcely to be accomplished, except by one who has been long resident in the Southern section. Perhaps the whole of it can scarcely be expected from a single hand. But there are men in the country who are able to contribute largely towards it. A person who will give a detailed account of slavery in any one State, cannot fail to produce a work of novelty and interest, and, at the same time, of great utility. The accounts of the institution in the books of travels which we have seen, are most meagre and unsatisfactory. The general remarks, which we often meet with from the apologists of slavery, upon the health, good spirits, and comfort of the slaves, and the lightness of their labors, in all which particulars they are sometimes said to be far better situated than the peasantry of New England, even if they do not excite a smile or a sigh of incredulity, give no definite information concerning the Arcadian felicity which they attest. On the other hand, the instances of oppression and cruelty, which are stated by writers opposed to slavery, though, no doubt, affording a strong argument against a system which necessarily leads to frequent and atrocious abuses, give us no means of judging of the usual situation of the negroes, under masters who are not distinguished for severity.

Many of our readers are probably not aware, that a volume, giving an account of the law of slavery in the Southern States, by Mr. George M. Strond, was published in 1826. The information given in this work, we think, will be found highly interesting and instructive, by all who wish to make themselves acquainted with the actual situation of the negro population at the South. A thorough account of the practice of slavery would make the subject complete. We conclude, by repeating our wish, that a work of this kind may be soon given to the public.

ERRATA. — Page 25, line 12, after good, insert a comma
“ 38, “ 39, for generation, read regeneration
“ 46, “ 40, “ our, “ an
“ 56, “ 41, “ Col., “ Cat.

THE TEACHER'S GIFT TO HIS PUPILS,

WITH NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS.

"The 'Gift' is composed of about twenty chapters, each chapter containing in itself a perfect story. The moral and religious truths they convey are expressed in a manner at once simple and interesting; while the stories, and the engravings with which they are connected, are admirably adapted to impress them strongly upon the mind. We recommend this little book, therefore, to parents as one which they may place in the hands of their children greatly to their profit and pleasure." — *Daily Advertiser*.

"The stories are told in a lively and impressive manner, and are made to inculcate good temper and virtuous habits. We are particularly pleased with the examples that may incite to kindness, forgiveness, resignation, watchfulness, gratitude, and filial affection. It is a neat and entertaining book." — *Education Reporter*.

TABLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,

FROM THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE PRESENT TIME.

Abstracted from Vater's "Synchronistischen Tafeln," by FRANCIS CUNNINGHAM.

A LETTER to an ORTHODOX CLERGYMAN, on Revivals of Religion. By BERNARD WHITMAN. Second Edition.

"To those who are desirous of seeing a faithful exposition of the modern policy with regard to revivals, which appear to be the 'last hope of the Orthodox'; of the manner in which they are got up by frequent prayer meetings, inquiry meetings, anxious meetings, four-days meetings, visiting from house to house, and other machinery; of their unchristian fruits; of the absurdity of ascribing them to the special influence of the Holy Spirit, and pronouncing all who oppose them, among whom are many of the most distinguished of the Orthodox themselves, the enemies of Christ, — this pamphlet will prove highly acceptable." — *Unitarian Advocate*.

CAUSES AND EVILS OF CONTENTIONS, Unveiled in Letters to Christians. By NOAH WORCESTER.

"This work is written in a mild, charitable spirit, and in a manner to win 'golden opinions' from all denominations. The grounds assumed are, that alienation and discord among professed believers in Christ tend to prevent the conversion of others, and to promote infidelity — and that party strifes and contentions among professed believers have been the principal reasons why so great a part of the world is yet enveloped in pagan darkness, and why Deism, and even Atheism, still show their heads in Christian lands." — *American Traveller*.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR STUART. TWO LETTERS to the Rev. MOSES STUART, on RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, occasioned by his Letters to the Rev. W. E. Channing. By BERNARD WHITMAN. Second Edition.

A REPLY to the REVIEW of WHITMAN'S LETTERS to Professor Stuart, in the "Spirit of the Pilgrims," for March, 1831. By BERNARD WHITMAN.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the COMMON VERSION, conformed to GRIESBACH'S STANDARD GREEK TEXT. Third Edition.

A SUPERB BIBLE,

WITHOUT NOTE OR COMMENT; IN TWO VOLS. IMPERIAL OCTAVO.

The publishers believe they can say with confidence, that this is one of the most elegant and accurate editions of the Holy Scriptures, that have appeared in any country.

The price is \$12 per copy, in glazed cambric binding; in elegant calf or morocco, from 17 to \$20.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

GRAY & BOWEN,

NO. 141, WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH, J. W. Foster.
EXETER, F. Grant.
DOVER, & } S. C. Stevens.
GREAT FALLS, }
KEENE, George Tilden.
CONCORD, Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.
CHARLESTOWN, Webber & Bowman.

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE, Hilliard & Brown.
DEDHAM, H. Mann & Son.
CONCORD, J. Stacy.
TAUNTON, F. Dunbar.
SALEM, { J. R. Buffum,
Whipple & Lawrence.
DANVERS, A. Trask, Jr.
NEWBURYPORT, { Charles Whipple,
T. B. White.
HINGHAM, C. & E. B. Gill.
NEW BEDFORD, William Howe.
NANTUCKET, George W. Ewer.
LANCASTER, Carter, Andrews, & Co.
GROTON, A. Richardson.
GREENFIELD, David Clark, Jr.
WORCESTER, C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD, Elisha Edwards.
NORTHAMPTON, Simeon Butler.

MAINE.

PORTLAND, Samuel Colman.
HALLOWELL, C. Spaulding.
BELFAST, E. T. Morrill.
AUGUSTA, H. Spaulding.
BANGOR, B. Nourse.
EASTPORT, H. S. Favor.
NORWAY, Asa Barton.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, { George Dana,
A. S. Beckwith.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN, H. Howe.
HARTFORD, H. & F. J. Huntington.
NORWICH, T. Robinson.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON, C. Goodrich.

NEW JERSEY.

TRENTON, D. Fenton.

NEW YORK.

ALBANY, Little & Cummings.
NEW YORK, { C. S. Francis,
D. Felt.
TRENTON, Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA, Bemis & Ward.
AUBURN, H. Ivison & Co.
BUFFALO, Steele & Faxon.
ROCHESTER, Marshall & Dean.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADEL- { E. Littell,
PHIA, { Carey & Hart.
PITTSBURG, Johnson & Stockton.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE, E. J. Coale.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON, Thompson & Homans.

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND, R. D. Sanxay.
NORFOLK, C. Hall.
WHEELING, A. & E. Picket.

KENTUCKY.

LOUISVILLE, James A. Frazer.
LEXINGTON, Thomas Smith.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI, { E. H. Flint,
Bradford & Co.,
N. & G. Guilford.
MARIETTA, N. Ward.

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH, J. Gales & Son.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON, Thomas Cousins.
COLUMBIA, B. D. & T. H. Plant.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA, W. J. Hobby.
SAVANNAH, Thomas M. Driscoll.

ALABAMA.

MOBILE, Odiorne & Smith.

TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, W. Tannehill.
CHRISTIANVILLE, B. S. Parsons.

MISSISSIPPI.

NATCHEZ, F. Beaumont.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, M. Carroll.

☞ The work will be sent *by mail* to any part of the United States, on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publishers, Boston, or to any of the agents, — subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.